R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 012 590

JC 660 204

INCREASING OPPORTUNITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS.

BY- MARTYN, KENNETH A.
CALIFORNIA STATE COORD. COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUC.
REPORT NUMBER CCHE-1026 PUB DATE JUL 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.88 72P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, CULTURAL BACKGROUND, SOCIAL BACKGROUND, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, SPECIAL PROGRAMS, EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED, *EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THE DISADVANTAGED STUDENT IS DEFINED IN TERMS OF FAMILY INCOME AND THE LOCATION OF FAMILY RESIDENCE. THIS DEFINITION IS THE ONE GENERALLY USED AND ACCEPTED BY THE COLLEGES. ON-CAMPUS VISITS AND AN INVENTORY OF PROVISIONS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS FROM ALL SEGMENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA, AS WELL AS A SEARCH OF RELATED LITERATURE, WERE UTILIZED IN COMPLETING THIS SURVEY. THE JUNIOR COLLEGES' PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL RECRUITING OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS IS NOT AS WELL DEVELOPED AS THOSE IN THE STATE COLLEGES OR THE UNIVERSITY. RELIANCE ON THE "OPEN-DOOR" ADMISSIONS POLICY AND THE CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE NEARBY HIGH SCHOOLS MAY ACCOUNT FOR THIS. OFF-CAMPUS TUTORIAL PROGRAMS ARE ALSO NOT AS WELL DEVELOPED IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGES, NOR ARE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROJECTS BY THE STUDENTS. HOWEVER, MOST OF THE DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS ATTENDING COLLEGE IN CALIFORNIA ARE ENROLLED IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGES. THE COUNSELING, REMEDIAL, AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS ARE PARTICULARLY SUITED TO AIDING SUCH STUDENTS, WHEN THEY HAVE ENROLLED. GREATER AWARENESS OF THE NEED FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS FROM DISADVANTAGED AREAS NEEDS TO BE DEVELOPED. ALSO, MORE EXTENSIVE CONTACT IS NEEDED WITH PARENTS OF SUCH STUDENTS WHILE THE STUDENTS ARE STILL IN JUNIOR HIGH AND HIGH SCHOOL. (HS)

JC 66 [illegible]

ED012590

COORDINATING
CALIFORNIA'S
HIGHER
EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INCREASING OPPORTUNITIES
IN
HIGHER EDUCATION
FOR
DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

COORDINATING
COUNCIL FOR
HIGHER
EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 10 1966

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Number 1028
July 1966

JC 660 204

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Representing the General Public:

WARREN M. CHRISTOPHER, Los Angeles
DR. ARTHUR G. COONS, Newport Beach, President of the Council
DR. GEORGE GELMAN, Bakersfield
BERT W. LEVIT, San Francisco
LOUIS J. KROEGER, San Francisco
ROBERT SETRAKIAN, San Francisco

Representing the Private Colleges and Universities:

FATHER CHARLES S. CASASSA, President, Loyola University of Los Angeles
DR. MILTON C. KLOETZEL, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Southern California
DR. C. EASTON ROTHWELL, President, Mills College

Representing the Public Junior Colleges:

MRS. ELEANORE D. NETTLE, Trustee of the College of San Mateo
MRS. TALCOTT BATES, Member, State Board of Education
STUART M. WHITE, Superintendent, State Center Junior College District and Vice President of the Council

Representing the California State Colleges:

DR. GLENN S. DUMKE, Chancellor of the State Colleges
LOUIS HEILBRON, Trustee
ALBERT J. RUFFO, Chairman of the Board of Trustees

Representing the University of California:

PHILIP L. BOYD, Regent
MRS. ELINOR HELLER, Regent
DR. CLARK KERR, President of the University

COUNCIL STAFF

WILLARD B. SPALDING, Director
ALVIN MARKS, Associate Director
SIDNEY W. BROSSMAN, Associate Director
KEITH SEXTON, Associate Director
FRANKLIN G. MATSLER, Higher Education Specialist
CHARLES McINTYRE, Higher Education Specialist
J. CLAUDE SCHEUERMAN, Higher Education Specialist
JOHN M. SMART, Higher Education Specialist
COURTLAND L. WASHBURN, Higher Education Specialist
LELAND MYERS, Research Associate
BERT K. SIMPSON, Research Associate
THEODORA M. THAYER, Fiscal Analyst
JOHN DYKES, Administrative Assistant
DOUGLAS ADCOCK, Staff Analyst
THIERRY F. KOENIG, Staff Analyst

INCREASING OPPORTUNITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION
FOR
DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

A Report Prepared for the Coordinating Council for Higher
Education by Dr. Kenneth A. Martyn, Professor of
Special Education, California State College
at Los Angeles

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

July 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE 5

RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON THE REPORT 7

INTRODUCTION 9
  Definition 10
  Methods and Limitations of the Survey 11

SECTION I—RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES 13
  Financial Barriers 14
  Geographic Barriers 16
  Motivational Barriers 17
  Academic Barriers 18

SECTION II—THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA 23
  Recruitment of Socio-economically Disadvantaged Students 23
  Off-Campus Tutorial Projects 26
  Community Participation Projects 27
  On-Campus Student Services 27
  Future Programs Planned for Socio-economically Disadvantaged Students 29

SECTION III—THE STATE COLLEGES 31
  Recruitment of Socio-economically Disadvantaged Students 31
  Off-Campus Tutorial Projects 32
  Community Participation Projects 33
  On-Campus Student Services 35
  Future Programs Planned for Socio-economically Disadvantaged Students 35

SECTION IV—THE JUNIOR COLLEGES 37
  Recruitment of Socio-economically Disadvantaged Students 37
  Off-Campus Tutorial Projects 38
  On-Campus Student Services 39

SECTION V—THE INDEPENDENT CALIFORNIA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES 43
  Recruitment of Socio-economically Disadvantaged Students 43
  Off-Campus Tutorial Projects 44
  On-Campus Student Services 45
  Future Programs Planned for Socio-economically Disadvantaged Students 46

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

Page

SECTION VI—SELECTED OUT-OF-STATE INSTITUTIONS 49
- University of Wisconsin 49
- New York University 51
- Bronx Community College 52
- The Loop Junior College 53

SECTION VII—FEDERAL, STATE, AND FOUNDATION AID 55
- Carnegie Corporation 55
- Ford Foundation 55
- Rockefeller Foundation 55
- Federal Aid 56
- Upward Bound 58

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, CONCLUSIONS 61
- Financial Barriers to Increased Opportunity 61
- Geographic Barriers to Increased Opportunity 63
- Motivational Barriers to Increased Opportunity 63
- Academic Barriers to Increased Opportunity 64

APPENDICES 67
- Appendix A Section I References 67
- Appendix B Section VI References 68
- Appendix C Recommendations from California State Scholarship Commission 69

BIBLIOGRAPHY 75

TABLES IN TEXT

Tables *Page*

1 Percent of Total Population, College Enrollment, Level of Attainment, by Region and Race 13

2 Higher Educational Status of a Survey Group in New Mexico in Relation to Family Income 14

3 Percentage Distribution of Amount of Scholarship Aid Received by Male Dropouts and Controls 15

4 Number of Students Participating in Work-Study Programs in California State Colleges, 1965–66 35

5 Number of Students Participating in the Work-Study Program in California Junior Colleges, 1965–66 39

6 California Junior Colleges Offering Basic Programs 41

7 Number of Students Participating in Work-Study Programs in the Independent California Colleges and Universities, 1965–66 45

8 Bronx Community College "College Discovery Program" Reasons for Withdrawal of Twenty-Two Students 53

PREFACE

Instituting this survey and preparing this report would not have been possible without the help and earnest cooperation of many persons. Dr. Lawrence Howard, Professor Belden Paulson, and Asst. Chancellor Donald McNeil provided much of the information and made possible the on-campus visit and interviews at the University of Wisconsin. The Dean and members of the faculty at Loop Junior College, President Morris Meister and Professor Rachel Wilkinson at Bronx Community College provided much valuable information and arranged for interviews and observations during my visit to those campuses. The staff of Project Apex at New York University not only arranged for interviews and provided information but also made it possible for me to observe in classes and spend several informal hours at meal time and in the residence halls with Apex students. Kenneth Neubeck of the U. S. Office of Education was particularly helpful in supplying research information and in providing contacts with other federal agencies.

Associate University Dean William Shepard wrote most of the material for the section on the University of California; Dean Tom McGrath distributed the inventory for the California State Colleges and provided a critical review of the State College section. Robert J. Bernard, Executive Director of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, adapted the questionnaire for distribution to the independent colleges and universities, and also reviewed the chapter on the independent colleges and universities. Similarly, Dr. Paul Lawrence, Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Kenneth Wood, Consultant, Junior College General Education, distributed the inventory to the Junior Colleges and provided valuable comments on the Junior College section of this report. Throughout the study, John Smart, Specialist in Higher Education for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, provided able direction, comments, and many valuable contacts. His effort and effective administrative support made the study more complete and timely than would otherwise have been possible. Of course, the final responsibility for the report and recommendations rests solely with the author.

RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON THE REPORT

The California Coordinating Council on Higher Education received and acted on this report at its meeting of May 24, 1966, in Los Angeles. The action of the Council with reference to the related recommendations of Dr. Martyn is included here. It should be noted that while the Council's action reflects many of Dr. Martyn's recommendations, the two lists are independent of each other.

The following was approved by the Council based on the author's report and a series of recommendations suggested by the Council staff:

1. **The Council directs its staff to actively encourage the segments of public higher education, together with other interested agencies such as the Office of Compensatory Education, California State Scholarship Commission and private colleges and universities as they may wish to participate, to develop special regional and/or statewide efforts to provide information concerning financial aid and college admissions information to counselors, junior and senior high school students, and their parents, especially from disadvantaged areas. Such special efforts might include preparation of special printed materials and organization of task forces; a pilot effort may first be made in a geographical area of major need.** [See page ~~96~~ 62 for author's recommendation.]
2. **In recognition of the special opportunity and benefits of the federally sponsored Work Study program, the Council advises the Trustees of the California State Colleges, the Regents of the University of California, and State Board of Education on behalf of the public Junior Colleges, and private colleges and universities to expand Work Study programs among the institutions of each segment. Each governing board on behalf of their respective institutions shall report to the Council by September 1, 1967, on the extent and uses of Work Study programs at that time.** [See page ~~96~~ 62 for author's recommendation.]
3. **The Council requests the California State Scholarship Commission to assess the need for undergraduate and graduate grants-in-aid in the segments of higher education in light of previous proposals and studies and taking note of current programs such as those of the Regents of the University of California and the newly developed federal programs. The report of this review should be made to the Council by November 1, 1967, and should include recommendations as to method of administration and source of funds should new, special State programs be found necessary.** [See pages ~~97~~ for author's recommendation.] 62 and 63
4. **The Council directs its staff to study jointly with the segments of higher education, the desirability of experimental higher education institutions and programs designed to meet the requirements of culturally disadvantaged students. This study of need for experimental institutions and programs to be reported to the Council by November 1967, with progress reports invited by November 1966, should take into account factors of location, student ethnic mix, overall curricula, and the employment of existing institutions and programs in such a manner.** [See page ~~98~~ 63 for author's recommendation.]
5. **The Council advises the Trustees, the Regents, the State Board of Education on behalf of the public Junior Colleges, and the private colleges and universities to encourage the continued development of student tutorial and community involvement projects conducted at individual colleges and campuses.** [See page ~~99~~ 63 for author's recommendation.]
6. **The Council advises the Trustees, the Regents, the State Board of Education on behalf of the public Junior Colleges, and the private colleges and universities to explore ways of expanding efforts to stimulate students from disadvantaged situations to seek higher education. These efforts should take place within present admissions policies and procedures—placing a special responsibility upon California's public Junior Colleges.** [See page ~~99~~ 64 for author's recommendation.]
7. **The Council directs its staff, as a part of previously approved studies, to pay particular attention to the current and possible employment of the 2% exception to State College and University first-time freshmen admissions procedures for admission of disadvantaged students not otherwise eligible and to determine whether the 2% exception should be expanded with an additional 2% to accommodate such students. The Council further directs its staff to examine the possible employment of an additional 2% exception to State College and University Junior College transfer admission procedures for students who have completed 60 or more units and who are disadvantaged students not otherwise eligible.** [See page ~~100~~ 64 for author's recommendation.]
8. **The Council requests the Trustees, Regents, and private colleges and universities to study the special programs designed or used for compensatory education of the disadvantaged in their respective institutions and to make report of such studies to the Council by September 1,**

1967. Such studies should include emphasis on an evalution of the programs in terms of student success and later progress in higher education and need for new approaches. The Council requests that the State Board of Education on behalf of the public Junior Colleges conduct a similar study for report by September 1, 1967, including examination of the need for and value of special learning centers for disadvantaged students. The Director of the Council shall suggest elements to be included within these studies; the studies shall be reviewed by the staff and comment made thereon to the Council. [See page ~~100~~ 64 and page ~~101~~ 65 for author's recommendations.]

9. **The Council advises the University of California that to undertake an interdisciplinary continuing study of the basic requirements of the socio-economically disadvantaged would be in the interest of the State.** [See page ~~102~~ 65 for author's recommendation.]
10. **The Council advises the California State Colleges that establishment of an institute for the study of teaching reading and language skills to the disadvantaged would be in the interest of the State.** [See page ~~102~~ 65 for author's recommendation.]

INTRODUCTION

To increase opportunities in higher education for students from disadvantaged areas has been the goal of intense efforts at the federal, state, and local level for the past several years. These efforts have been encouraged and supported by the Carnegie Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation and most recently by the federal Higher Education Act of 1965, the Equal Opportunities Act of 1964 and 1965, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Action on the national scene has been matched by the California Scholarship Act and the Compensatory Education Act, initiating development of the compensatory education program in California. Concurrently, at the local level tutoring, recruitment, and financial aid programs at the University of California, the State Colleges, the Junior Colleges and among private colleges and universities have been increasing. It was within this spirit of greatly increased concern and action from a wide variety of sources that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education raised several significant questions about higher education in California in the late spring and early summer of 1965. Director Willard Spalding outlined the concern of the Coordinating Council in the request for this survey as follows:

1. A survey of currently operating and planned programs designed to increase the ability of socio-economically disadvantaged students to gain admittance to higher education institutions and to remain therein while completing their college work; the survey to include programs in California among all segments of higher education and selected out-of-state efforts.
2. A survey of federally sponsored programs and federal and state funds available to higher education to meet the objective of increasing higher education opportunities for the socio-economically disadvantaged.
3. Suggestions and recommendations concerning programs best suited to California institutions by segment and by area, if appropriate, and, in light of the functions of the Council, any areas or programs requiring statewide coordination.

The specific questions to which this study is directed are as follows:

What is being done to recruit students from high schools in disadvantaged areas to the segments of higher education in California?

What special counseling, tutorial, or other programs to increase motivation towards higher education are currently used by each of the segments?

What kinds of financial aid are available, and what kinds of financial aid are being used for students in socio-economically disadvantaged areas in each of the segments?

What is the extent of participation in the Work-Study programs by the institutions of higher education in California?

What special counseling programs, remedial services, or tutorial programs are available to socio-economically disadvantaged students once they arrive on campus?

Do special courses or curricula exist for the benefit of such students?

What methods or devices have been developed to help maintain their motivation, as well as increase their ability to profit from higher education?

How are students from disadvantaged areas encouraged to advance to graduate study?

What special curricula or new plans are forthcoming in the segments of California higher education to increase opportunities for disadvantaged youth?

And finally, would a special role for each of the segments of higher education in California improve the endeavor to increase opportunities in higher education for socio-economically disadvantaged students?

Do the functions of the University, State Colleges, and Junior Colleges overlap in providing for disadvantaged youth?

Will federal financial assistance from many different agencies increase the danger that the segments would inappropriately duplicate efforts for the socio-economically disadvantaged?

Do gaps exist in the provisions for disadvantaged students that need to be examined and, with some coordination, filled by one or more of the higher education segments of California?

What action should be taken by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in this important area of concern?

With these questions in mind, the Director of the Coordinating Council commissioned this survey of efforts to increase opportunities in higher education for socio-economically disadvantaged students.

DEFINITION

A number of professional articles and several papers presented at conferences of educators have expressed concern with the question of definition of culturally disadvantaged. Frequently, the discourse on definition involved a variety of different titles. Are such students culturally disadvantaged, culturally deprived, economically disadvantaged, culturally different, underprivileged, socially disadvantaged, or can some other name, title, or definition be used? A basic part of most studies requires a definition of terms to be used. Clear communication on the topic to be studied and a reasonable understanding of the terms to be used are required if the resulting data and information are not to be confused.

On the other hand, when new programs are being started with as much imagination and creativity as is needed in the education of disadvantaged children, preoccupation with definition is frequently viewed with disdain. Comments such as, "We know which students from our area are the subject of needed improvements," and, "Let's get on with getting them into college and helping them to be successful here and worry about the definitions later," from respondents in this study were not uncommon. Nevertheless, it has been suggested that in any survey of institutions in California some statement of the definition being used by institutions be included. Therefore, colleges were asked to report the definition, or definitions, they used.

Most of the institutions defined socio-economically disadvantaged in the economic terms that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the other federal acts have defined disadvantaged student. Whether he is termed culturally disadvantaged, economically disadvantaged, or socio-economically disadvantaged, essentially such a student is from a family with extremely low income, most often living in the slum areas of cities or extremely poor and isolated areas in rural communities.

METHODS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

It is easy to confuse programs sponsored by higher education institutions for the benefit of the socio-economically disadvantaged, in general, and those specifically designed to increase higher education opportunities for the socio-economically disadvantaged student. For instance, individual members of the University faculty have research programs on the nature and characteristics of the disadvantaged student and on characteristics of certain urban areas. Programs have been supported in the State Colleges, on the education of teachers for disadvantaged areas, and cooperative projects have been organized with school districts to improve their provisions for disadvantaged students. While such projects are sponsored by the University or the State Colleges and are concerned with disadvantaged areas, they are not the subject of this study. This study is limited specifically to the question of increasing the *opportunities in higher education* for disadvantaged students and toward making it likely that when such students are admitted to an institution of higher education, they will ultimately succeed.

Developing an appropriate method to conduct this survey required consideration of several difficulties. It was anticipated that most of the programs would be incipient, while many others would be merely in a planning stage. Concern strictly with numbers would likely miss important aspects of such programs, including their quality and effectiveness—not in the sense of formal evaluation, but in the sense of promise and personal evaluation for those being helped by special provisions. To rely solely on a survey inventory of what was being done would be inadequate for such a study.

Certainly, an examination of the literature proved helpful. However, published information on the most *recent* work on endeavors of institutions of higher education to increase opportunities for disadvantaged youth is meager in important detail. Also, statements on the most exciting, and in many respects the most important programs, have not yet been published. In fact, no single directory, or even group of directories, of those programs financed by federal agencies is presently available. In many cases, pilot grants and even completed studies are not reported in the literature and are not readily available from the various federal offices, so that written and library resources had to be supplemented for this study. For these reasons, several different methods have been used to obtain answers to the questions to which this study was directed.

First, government documents, professional journals, summaries of conferences, the documents in the libraries of the University of California at Los Angeles and California State College at Los Angeles, and other written information related to the problem of increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged youth were examined. The second approach was to correspond with knowledgeable persons in the segments of higher education in California and selected institutions in other states who had published or participated in some aspect of programs for socio-economically disadvantaged. From this correspondence, further leads to operating programs and some names of persons who could provide further information were obtained. The third approach was to obtain from particular federal agencies and offices a directory of institutions, grants made, studies commissioned, reports received, and names of persons responsible for the various branches of federal aid.

After some help from individuals within each of the segments of higher education and preliminary on-campus interviews, a formal request for specific information was made to the University of California, to the Chancellor's Office of the California State Colleges, to the State Department of Education, and after suggestion of the Council, to the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities. The same categories of information were requested from each of the segments of higher education. Specifically, they were as follows:

1. Definition: If a particular definition or definitions are being used, please include these in your report.*
2. Recruitment: What is being done to recruit students from among socio-economically disadvantaged youth? If exceptions to "normal" admission requirements are made, please indicate what these are and the number of students so admitted.
3. What tutorial or other programs are presented off-campus to assist socio-economically disadvantaged students enrolled in high schools?
4. What special counseling programs, remedial services, or tutorial programs are available to assist socio-economically disadvantaged students on campus? Wherever possible, include the numbers involved.
5. Please indicate if you have any programs designed to encourage socio-economically disadvantaged students to undertake graduate study.
6. What programs designed to assist socio-economically disdvantaged students are sponsored on your campus by student service agencies such as YMCA, YWCA, etc.?
7. What special scholarship, grant, loan, or other financial aid programs are available that are designed *particularly* for socio-economically disadvantaged students?
8. Do you have a Work-Study Program available on your campus? What is the approximate number of students involved?
9. What, if any, special programs or curricula not described under any of the above questions are currently in operation on your campus?
10. What plans do you have for additional programs to be undertaken in the near future?

Each of the segments of higher education in California emphasized those aspects of the request for information that suited its particular role. The special counseling program and remedial services for on-campus students were, of course, answered more fully from the Junior Colleges, while the question regarding graduate study was more appropriate to the University and the State Colleges. Nevertheless, the questionnaire did provide a framework for a comparison of the answers.

While the inventory was being answered, on-campus visits to selected institutions outside of California were made, and additional observations and interviews were held later on campuses of the segments of higher education in California. These on-campus visits generally followed receipt of additional information about the program from the individual campus. Administrators, teachers, counselors, and students were interviewed, and in some instances, the related high schools were visited.

SUMMARY

The disadvantaged student is defined in terms of family income and the location of family residence. The definition used in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the one generally accepted and used by the colleges. On-campus visits and inventory of provisions for disadvantaged students from all segments of higher education in California, as well as search of related literature, were utilized in completing this survey. The nature of the reports and the nature of the programs developed have necessitated the use of some judgment and selectivity in preparing this written report.

---

* Not requested of the University of California.

SECTION I

RELATED LITERATURE*

Studies of Bridgman and Wolfle have received major attention for the data these studies have provided showing the wastage of brain power in America.[1] While the percentage of intellectually able youth is higher in the suburban upper middle and upper class neighborhoods, the total number of youth with sufficient intellectual ability to succeed in college, but who do not attend college, is greater in the middle and lower class urban centers. Statistics are often quoted to show that from forty-five to sixty per cent of youth, nationwide, with sufficient ability to complete college successfully, do not. For the most part, these statistics refer to urban disadvantaged youth.

A viable democratic society requires, first of all, social mobility and decreasing social stratifications. Hodges put it this way, "To explain the dynamic fluidity of urban social systems in raw economic terms is to bypass the school—the most elemental of all the agents which facilitate that upward thrust of the talented, which is so necessary to the very survival of industrial societies."[2] Hurley H. Doddy, Professor of Education at Howard University, wrote,

> There is probably no belief so deeply rooted in the American way of life as the idea of acquiring an education as a means of individual and social advancement. . . . Today, for an ever increasing number of Americans, it means going to college. There is the widely held view that in our technical society of tomorrow only those who possess higher education will be able to function as productive members. As an American, the Negro holds this belief in the value of education for personal advancement.[3]

Some indications exist that other minority groups are now beginning to concentrate on higher education as a vehicle for upward social mobility.[4]

While progress has been made in increasing opportunities in higher education for culturally different youth, much remains to be done. From 1940 to 1960 the percentage of college graduates in the total population rose from five per cent to eight per cent; during this period the percentage of non-white college graduates rose from one per cent to three per cent. The ratio of white to non-white college graduates was reduced from 3.79 to 2.21. Thus, during the past twenty years the proportion of non-whites to whites in the total population who are completing college is steadily narrowing. Nevertheless, the discrepancy is still about two to one.[5] An examination of college enrollment for whites and non-whites probably reflects the proportionate enrollment of economically and culturally disadvantaged youth. Another indication of progress from this perspective is shown in Table 1 which analyses college enrollment by region and race.

TABLE 1

Per Cent of Total Population, College Enrollment, Level of Attainment, by Region and Race

	% of population enrolled in college		% of population attending level of college training: 1 to 3 years		4 or more years	
Section	White	Non-white	White	Non-white	White	Non-white
Northeast	7.7	3.3	7.	4.7	8.4	3.6
North Central	6.6	3.7	8.	5.8	7.1	3.3
South	6.4	2.9	9.	2.9	7.9	3.1
West	7.9	6.7	12.	8.4	9.8	5.4

Source: U. S. Census of Population, General Social and Economic Characteristics, P C (1)—1C, page 241, as published in Hurley H. Doddy, "The Progress of the Negro in Higher Education," *The Journal of Negro Education*, 32 (Fall, 1963) 487.

From Table 1 it can be seen that in the West the percentage of non-whites enrolled in higher education is equal to the percentage of whites enrolled in the North Central section and above the percentage of whites in the South. Notwithstanding these indications of progress, the absolute postion of this relative minority group is still substantialy behind the white position in utilization of opportunities in higher education.

Many studies have examined the barriers to increasing opportunities in higher education. These identified barriers appear to fall into four categories—financial barriers, geographic barriers, motivational barriers, and academic barriers. The nature of a hindrance to college attendance depends more on the potential student's perception of the difficulty, in many respects, than it does on the true character of the problem. If financial need is perceived as a barrier, then it becomes one, whether jusified objectively or not. If location and transportation are perceived to be barriers to higher education, then they become such.[6] If the possibility and desire for higher education remains a vague and unfulfilled hope rather than a spur to action, then lack of motivation becomes a critical barrier. Each of these barriers to increased opportunity in higher education for disadvantaged youth has received attention in the literature.

---

* See Appendix for references

FINANCIAL BARRIERS*

Overcoming financial barriers to higher education has received considerable attention in recent years. Three aspects of the cost of higher education to the students are: (1) the direct costs of college attendance, including tuition, fees, and book costs, (2) the cost of room, board, and clothing, and (3) the indirect costs of reduced or lost income for the student or his family during college years.

At first glance, it appears that free or low tuition negates the need for scholarships. Some have claimed that the free tuition of state universities in America is the greatest scholarship program available. West has pointed out, however, that,

> The terms 'free tuition' and 'scholarship' are hardly synonymous, for such usage would mean scholarships were being offered by the state institutions to the wealthy (note that 5 per cent of the parents of students at Wisconsin had incomes of $35,000 or more) as freely as to those of low income—perhaps more so, because those with very low income would have trouble attending even if there were no tuition charges.[7]

Increases in the cost of attending college are obvious. All three aspects of college costs have increased rapidly in recent years. Estimates of these increases range from twenty-two to forty per cent, in direct costs alone.[8] The indirect costs have been rising even more rapidly.[9]

Just as there is a direct relationship between income and the socio-culturally disadvantaged, there is a direct relationship between income and attendance in higher education. Table 2 illustrates this relationship.

TABLE 2

Higher Educational Status of a Survey Group in New Mexico in Relation to Family Income

Annual Family Income	Number of Students, by Family Income	Percent in College with Scholarship Aid	Percent in College without Scholarship Aid	Percent in College Part Time	Percent Planning to Attend College Later	Percent Not Planning to Attend College Later
0-$500	14	14.3	7.1	0	0	78.6
$501-$1,000	133	17.3	8.3	3.8	9.0	61.6
$1,001-$2,000	299	18.8	14.3	10.1	9.8	47.0
$2,001-$3,000	346	18.5	25.1	7.2	5.4	43.8
$3,001-$4,000	340	16.9	40.3	9.6	3.5	29.7
$4,001-$6,000	168	21.4	40.5	4.5	4.5	28.3
$6,001-$9,000	89	28.1	48.7	2.2	0	22.4
$9,001-$11,000	19	10.5	52.6	15.8	0	21.1
$11,000-higher	150	24.7	60.6	4.0	0	10.7

Source: Sherman E. Smith et al., *Are Scholarships the Answer?* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1961), as published in Elmer D. West, *Financial Aid to the Undergraduate*, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1963, p. 21.

The data shown in Table 2, though based on a study in New Mexico, is typical of studies elsewhere in the United States. It shows not only the relationship between college attendance and family income but also that scholarship aid occurs as often for those from higher income families as for those students from low income families.

The forms of financial aid to help students overcome financial barriers have been scholarships, grants, loans, and employment. Scholarship funds are concentrated in a limited number of colleges and universities. A study of National Merit scholars showed that forty-three per cent of the scholarship offers came from only seven per cent of the 532 institutions which offered scholarships to this select group.[10] A major portion, sixty-six per cent, of the scholarships offered in the National Merit Scholarship Program came from colleges and universities in contrast to those supported by business, industry, and foundations.[11] A 1963 report by the College Entrance Examination Board stated,

> Though many other agencies and organizations, including the federal and state governments, private corporations, foundations, civic groups, and others, support student aid programs, the sum total of these efforts on behalf of undergraduates does not, though sizable, equal the expenditure by colleges and universities for this purpose.[12]

Notwithstanding the considerable increase in total scholarship money, the increase in funds available has not kept up with the increase in students and college costs. For example, during the ten years from 1950 to 1960 the endowed student aid capital funds at Harvard grew from 9.9 million dollars to 26.6 million dollars. While this was an increase in one decade equal to almost double the total reached in the first 315 years of Harvard's history, at the end of the ten-year period, Harvard was offering scholarship assistance to approximately the same percentage of its students.[13] In fact, "It gave to scholarship holders significantly less help in proportion to the total cost of a Harvard education in 1960 than in 1950 and required a much larger self-help contribution from the student."[14]

A 1962 report from the United States Office of Education showed that three states—New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts—accounted for almost one-third of the total scholarship awards made throughout the United States. California was sixth in comparison with other states in the total amount of scholarship funds available at that time.[15]

Considerable publicity has been given to scholarship funds that are available. In many cases, substantial funds have been contributed towards scholarship programs. However, in many cases, the size of the scholarships is not at all commensurate with the other increased costs in higher education. Frequently, scholarships are awarded as tokens for incentive and recognition rather than financial aid. While such awards serve publicity purposes, they make very little contribution to the lowering of financial barriers to higher education.

---

* This section was written prior to receipt of the study, *The Financial Barrier to Higher Education in California* by Edward Sanders and Hans Palmer, a study prepared for the California State Scholarship Commission. However, the recommendations from this study are consistent with the recommendations in the Summary section. Note also Appendix C—Recommendations from California State Scholarship Commission.

The best known and most widely publicized scholarship programs apparently do very little to bring youth from lower income families to college. In the main, these funds concentrate on students in the upper one per cent of ability and in upper middle class families.[16]

Thistlethwaite made a comprehensive study of National Merit examinees. Forty-two per cent of the men and thirty-nine per cent of the women from families with limited financial resources reported that financial need was the greatest single barrier to college.[17] From this group he asked examinees who did not go to college and whose family income was approximately $4,000 or less per year whether they would go to college if they had more money. Sixty per cent of the students said, "Yes." He wrote,

> It appears that at least sixty per cent of the men and forty per cent of the women not enrolling in college could have been recruited for higher education if suitable financial aid had been available. A more optimistic estimate, based on the time of decision, is that perhaps eighty per cent of the men and seventy-five per cent of the women could have been recruited into college if incentives had been provided as early as the junior year of high school.[18]

Thistlethwaite also concluded,

> When we control aptitude test scores, rank in high school class, amount of mathematics taken in high school, and such instrumental behaviors as applying for scholarships and loans, there still remains a significant positive correlation between exposure to a scholarship offer and college attendance.[19]

A recent study in Delaware reported thirty-one per cent of the factors cited for lack of college attendance refer to financial problems.[20] A study by Smith in New Mexico has been made to determine the extent to which scholarship offers to students who had not previously planned to attend college would affect their subsequent behavior. He found that approximately one per cent of the high school graduates each year who had both the required scholastic qualifications and the desire to enroll in a liberal arts curriculum, and who for financial reasons had been unable to do so, actually did enroll.[21] A study in Florida by the State Junior College Advisory Board reported the results of a questionnaire to junior college faculty. Forty per cent of the faculty reported receiving some scholarship help (including GI Bill) as undergraduates.[22]

Table 3 shows the relationship between amount of scholarship aid received and percentage of dropouts. This is from a study by Cliff based on a population of 1,188 families who had completed the detailed financial questionnaire of College Scholarship Service. It compared male students who had dropped out of college with a control group of students who had not dropped out. The two groups were almost identical on family economic and demographic variables and on SAT scores. The two groups differ only in that the drop-out group received, on the average, $200 less in scholarship aid their first year in college. This table shows the distribution of scholarship aid received by male dropouts and controls.

TABLE 3

Percentage Distribution of Amount of Scholarship Aid Received by Male Dropouts and Controls

	Nothing	*$1-$499*	*$500- $999*	*$1,000- $1,499*	*$1,500 or more*
Dropout ...	50.8	22.5	16.9	6.8	1.7
Control ...	30.3	26.7	20.6	17.6	4.8

Source: Elmer D. West, *Financial Aid to the Undergraduate,* American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1963, p. 61.

Grants and loans have received increased attention as means of providing financial aid to college students. A description of characteristics of borrowers was reported by the United States Office of Education. Each student who signed a note for a loan under the National Defense Education Act completed a questionnaire. The study involved 30,246 questionnaires completed by such borrowers obtaining a first loan.[23] The greatest number of borrowers were eighteen years old; three out of five were men; three out of four were single; thirty per cent were freshmen; twenty-one per cent were sophomores; nine per cent were juniors; and twenty-three per cent were seniors. Throughout the nation, seventy-one per cent of the borrowers came from families whose annual income was $6,000 and under. (In 1960 the average family income, after federal taxes, was $6,160.) Seventy-three per cent of the borrowers had brothers and sisters of college age or younger; forty-five per cent had two or more siblings of college age or younger; eighty-one per cent of the borrowers had saved less than $250; and approximately five per cent had saved more than $500. Sixty-three per cent of the borrowers planned to teach, and of those planning to teach, eighty-five per cent were financing half or more of their expenses from sources outside the family.

Henderson concluded,

> At institutions where there have been substantial loan funds, they have not been fully used. For a variety of reasons, students hesitate to encumber themselves with substantial loans that need to be paid off in the future. They may hesitate to launch upon a career with this type of obligation hanging over them.[24]

Henderson further concluded,

> The assumption that underlies the loan plan, namely, that the student should pay a large part of the cost of his education, is contrary to the needs in society today. Such a policy would impede the attendance of students at college rather than en-

courage attendance. It would penalize students from lower-income families because those persons would begin their careers with substantial debt whereas other students would not.[25]

Another form of financial aid is employment. Many of those in positions of considerable responsibility today recall the days when they "worked their way through college." With the normal human tendency to remember the good and forget the bad, the expectation that students today should also work their way through college influences their perception of the need for additional financial aid. Many believe that capable, but needy, students of today should be able to solve their problems through work. West has pointed out that such persons tend to overlook two things:

> The rapidly rising cost of higher education and the substantially higher standards. It is still possible for a student with sufficient ability and sufficient motivation to work his way through college—or to go a long way toward doing so. But it is much more difficult today to earn the total cost of a college education while attending college; and because of increased academic requirements it is more difficult to get through—or remain in college—than it was in a past generation. The cost to a student in time, in effort, and in the sacrifice of full opportunity to learn may be so great, particularly if he cannot attend college near home, as to be almost prohibitive. And 'working one's way' becomes relative. Probably few of those who make such a claim actually did so entirely; many received help in some form.[26]

The Work-Study Program, which limits the amount of time per week the student may participate and provides work opportunities that are less likely to interfere with the student's academic program, has made a major contribution toward overcoming financial barriers for the economically disadvantaged. Nevertheless, from the literature on financial aids toward increasing opportunities in higher education, it is apparent that financial need can still be one of the greatest barriers to higher education, particularly for disadvantaged youth.

GEOGRAPHIC BARRIERS

Geographic barriers to higher education are very closely related to the problem of financial resources. For the student with appropriate financial means, location of the college he chooses to attend is unlikely to be a serious barrier to his enrollment. However, for the student of limited means the location of the college he might attend is a significant factor in his decision to enroll. Daughtry conducted a survey of Kansas high school graduates in 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959. During that period, he found that forty per cent of Kansas high school graduates enrolled in a college or university in the fall following completion of high school. He found that the "proximity factor" was important if the high school was located within ten miles of a college or university. He found little or no difference among high schools located ten to twenty-five miles, twenty-five to fifty miles, fifty to one hundred miles, or more than one hundred miles from the nearest institution of higher education. He concluded that "beyond an easy commuting range of ten miles, distance from a college campus is not an important factor in whether or not a Kansas boy or girl goes to college."[27]

The development of the Junior College opportunities throughout California has considerably reduced geographic barriers for students. The planning of State College and University campuses with consideration for statewide needs also makes a major contribution toward increasing opportunities for all youth. Henderson reports that the public two-year colleges throughout the United States are increasing rapidly. He cited the California Junior College system as an "extraordinary demonstration in one state" of what might and should happen in many states. He also cited the California State College system which places State Colleges on a carefully planned regional basis and the University of California with its planned multi-campus expansion as models for other states.[28]

The establishment of a college campus increases the likelihood that high school graduates in the immediate area will enroll in that college. It also increases the total number of students from such high schools who attend college. Unfortunately, colleges in urban centers rely on the student living at home, rather than in on-campus residences. Such an arrangement reduces the direct financial cost to the student. However, if inadequate study facilities are available in the home, the chances of the student's remaining in college until graduation are reduced. There appears to be no report in the literature at this time on the effect of campus residence in urban areas on the retention of disadvantaged students.

One aspect of the location problem, however, is availability of transportation. Students from disadvantaged areas are less likely to have public transportation or family transportation as readily available as students in other areas. The report of the McCone Commission stated,

> Our investigation has brought into clear focus the fact that the inadequate and costly public transportation currently existing throughout the Los Angeles area seriously restricts the residents of the disadvantaged areas such as south central Los Angeles. This lack of adequate transportation handicaps them in seeking and holding jobs, attending schools, shopping, and in fulfilling other needs.[29]

A related problem to the geographic location of colleges in disadvantaged areas is the problem of segregation of minority groups.[30] The perpetuation or intensification of segregation in schools is as serious a problem as the necessity to increase opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged youth. Preventing a college from contributing to the "ghettos" is as important as locating colleges in disadvantaged areas. The ethnic, social and economic composition of the student body, therefore, must be considered in the location of colleges in disadvantaged areas.[31]

MOTIVATIONAL BARRIERS

Sociologists have pointed out for some time that, compared to middle class culture, the slum culture was one in which little effort was made to instill in the child a drive to achieve in school and to forego the pleasures of the present for possible greater gains in the future. "The evidence suggests that achievement motivation results from the interactions of the child with the parents . . . and is strongly influenced by the social class position of that parent."[32]

A number of papers describing programs for the Upward Bound Projects indicate that involvement of parents in the consideration of college attendance clearly enhances the student's persistence in college enrollment as a goal. In his study of motivation of gifted youth, Stivers concluded, "The goal seems to be a result . . . of certain experiences with parents, teachers, classmates, and others who as early as elementary school days set college as a standard of achievement for the student."[33]

Others have reported that parents' knowledge of college possibilities increased the students' chances of college attendance. Monro summarized Stouffer's report on interviews with parents who were thought to be indifferent to higher education for their children. "The interviewers found no real hostility to college, just deep ignorance about it." He predicted that, "If we keep at the effort to interpret the college idea to working-class families, we have a good chance to make a large breakthrough."[34] Stouffer's prediction was supported by Schreiber's report on successful work with families of students in a program at Junior High School # 43 in New York.[35]

Havighurst concluded that the following program would increase the motivation of able lower-income boys going to college:

(1) Through an expanded counseling program in the junior and senior high school, identify the able boys not well-motivated for college and inform then and their parents of the possibility of college, and the advantages that might come from it. Also, inform the teachers about this group of boys who are good college material but not likely to go to college unless influenced by the school.

(2) Through the skillful use of honor awards, assembly programs, clubs, and other extracurricular activities, and through collaboration with service clubs and other community organizations, increase the social desirability and the social prestige of going to college.[36]

The importance of reward and recognition as a means of increasing motivation for students from disadvantaged areas has been reported by a number of researchers. Douvan summarized her research in this regard as follows:

> Middle class parents, in rearing their children, assert demands for individual success earlier and more regularly than do parents in the working class. Since children in working class homes are not so vigorously urged to personal attainment, it was hypothesized that their motivation to succeed would vary more directly with changes in the reward potential of task situations. High school students from both social classes were given a series of tasks under two reward conditions. In one, reward was limited to personal satisfaction derived from attaining a norm; in the other, a material reward was added to this satisfaction. Though members of both class groups responded similarly to the material reward condition, the achievement strivings of working class dropped significantly when the material reward was absent, while the motivation of middle class remained at approximately the same high level.

Parents' participation and knowledge of college possibilities affects the student's image of himself. Plaut recommended,

> We must help those identified to change their own, as well as their parents', images of themselves: the image of themselves as permanent strugglers for survival to one in which going to college is not only possible but likely—not just for the sake of going to college but to prepare for careers for which college training is necessary.[38]

The image that the student has of himself is influenced not only by his parents' expectations and the school's expectations, but also by the expectations of his peers. Two studies confirm this conclusion. McDill and Coleman, using students from a limited number of high schools, have shown that the prestige of the adolescents in the school social system contributed greatly to the variation of students' stated college plans.[39] Thistlethwaite completed a study of National Merit Scholars and found that social recognition for outstanding performance made a substantial contribution toward the student's desire to attend college, to the likelihood that he would obtain scholarship assistance in college, to stimulate him to seek advanced degrees, and to motivate him to enter college teaching or a research career.[40]

Early designation and recognition of students who have college potential appears to be one important step in increasing motivation for college attendance. Involving parents early in this recognition further increases the motivation for the student. Including parents in the counseling program after the student attends college may further increase the likelihood that the student will be successful.[41]

Parents influence the achievement motivation of students. Apparently the influence of parents is even greater, in some respects, in low socio-economic classes, probably because the amount and direction of parents' influence varies to a much greater extent in such families.[42] In the Negro families the influence of the mother on achievement and ambition seems to be particularly great. Gist and Bennett concluded,

> Females, both inside and outside the family, actually are more influential for Negro children than are males, while this is not true of white parents. It is important to note that while both races attributed strong and ambitious attempts by mothers to influence decisions, only among Negroes does the mother actually seem to possess greater influence than the father.[43]

The desire to attend college for students from disadvantaged areas appears to relate to financial feasibility, geographic availability, academic success, and also to general motivation. Those factors that influence this general motivation include desire for social recognition, the influence of peers, the expectations of the family, and previous scholastic recognition. The development of the student's image of himself as a person bound for college is apparently influenced by all of these factors. Finally, the achievement motive is also influenced by economic and vocational success strivings and the relationship the student sees between this and college attendance.[44]

ACADEMIC BARRIERS

Among the most formidable barriers to increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged youth is that group of obstacles frequently labeled academic. This rubric includes those problems which are related to admissions requirements, language ability, entrance tests, prerequisites to courses, general education requirements, and remedial or "bone head" courses. The admissions requirements of the State Colleges now place directly or indirectly very heavy emphasis on language ability through the aptitude test scores and the grades in high school subjects. Similarly, the University of California entrance requirements place heavy emphasis on those aspects of language facility that affect academic aptitude. Increasingly the Junior Colleges are using academic aptitude tests with heavy emphasis on verbal ability to "stream" or divert students to special programs. Clearly the student's facility with language is a very basic part of the necessary equipment for him to take advantage of opportunities in higher education in California today.

Even after the student is enrolled in an institution of higher education, his continuation and success in this endeavor is most directly influenced by his language ability. An examination of the relationship between linguistic development, language facility, and the education and development of youth from disadvantaged areas is directly relevant to the problem of increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged youth. Simply stating that we must maintain academic standards in higher education is an insufficient answer to the problem of overcoming linguistic barriers to higher education for disadvantaged youth. While there may not be any practical immediate method of dramatically lowering this barrier without perverting the objectives of higher education, a constant examination and experimentation with every possible means of obtaining even the slightest lowering of this barrier is fundamental to increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged youth. It appears, at this time, that this is the most difficult barrier, and an examination of the literature supports this conclusion.

Bernstein stated,

> An examination of the literature of both sociology and psychology shows that socio-cultural factors can depress or raise the level of educational performance. It is clear that children from extreme social groups within societies are exposed from an early age to separate and distinct patterns of learning before their formal education begins.[45]

He also wrote,

> A study of particular interest here is one by Dawe (1942), who planned a training scheme with a group of orphaned children, matching eleven pairs of children for age, sex, I.Q., and school group. Gains in the trained group were reflected in an increase in average I.Q. from 80.6 points to 94.8 points. Although the relation between language ability and I.Q. is one of complex reciprocity, these studies indicate that the functional level of performance may be independent of the I.Q. in an environment detrimental to the development of language skills. Linguistic differences—other than dialect—occur in the normal social environment, and status groups may be distinguished by their forms of language use. This difference is most marked where the gap between the socio-economic levels is very great.[46]

After a thorough examination of the literature of sociology and psychology on this matter, Bernstein stated,

> The evidence from these language studies indicates that the level of linguistic skill may be independent

> of the potential I.Q., certainly independent of measured non-verbal I.Q., and that grossly different environments affect aspects of language structure and vocabulary. It is also clear that linguistic performance is basic to educational success. It is suggested that the measurable inter-status linguistic differences between the lower working class and middle-class, rather than simply reflecting differences in potential capacity, result from entirely different modes of speech, which are dominant and typical of these strata.[47]

The ideas expressed by Bernstein are reflected in almost all of the literature on relationship between social class and linguistic development.[48]

Ausubel concluded,

> It is small wonder, therefore, that the abstract vocabulary of the culturally deprived child is deficient in range and precision, that his grammar and language usage are shoddy, that his attentivity and memory are poorly developed, and that he is impoverished in such language-related knowledge as the number concepts, self-identity information, and understanding of the physical, geometric, and geographical environments. Social class differences in language and conceptual measures also tend to increase with increasing age, thus demonstrating the cumulative effects of both continued environmental deprivation and of initial deficit in language development.[49]

John and Goldstein examined the relationship between social deprivation and language acquisition as it affects most directly the handling of abstract ideas. Their study focused

> upon the gradual shift in the child's use of words, from labeling specific and often single referents to the use of words for signifying categories of objects, actions, or attributes. The hypothesis advanced is that the rate and breadth of this shift varies from one social context to another, and that it has differential consequences for cognitive development dependent on the social context in which it occurs.[50]

As they examined the literature and other research, they pointed out,

> If the lower-class child has to rely upon the frequency of co-occurrence of label and referent to a greater extent than the middle-class child, then, for him, the invariance between word and referent must also be greater. Yet, the learning of verbs and gerunds by frequency of occurrence instead of by active dialogue is more difficult than is the learning of labels for specific objects. Gerunds such as "tying" were failed, not because the children were deficient in experience with the referent but rather because they had difficulty in fitting the label to the varying forms of action observed and experienced. This fitting process, which consists of selecting the specific connection between word and referent, occurs more easily when there is a variety of verbal interaction with adults. The middle-class child learns by feedback; by being heard, corrected, and modified—by gaining 'operant control' over his social environment by using words that he hears. The child learns by interacting with an adult teacher who plays an active role in simplifying the various components of word-referent relationships.[51]

The reports of special programs, including those in the "Upward Bound" Projects, show recognition of the problem of language development and linguistic facility as a barrier to higher education for disadvantaged youth. The emphasis on remedial programs and remedial training, particularly in writing, speaking, and reading, is a part of almost every program designed to lower barriers to college success for disadvantaged youth.

LeBrant has stated that, nevertheless,

> The aims of the program [higher education] for the culturally different student are intrinsically the same as those for the majority group: ability to speak good colloquial language; ability to read the various types of literature and to have some understanding of the values making for quality, to have sufficient acquaintance with selected great writers to know that they exist, and to have a desire to know them better; ability to communicate clearly in writing and to understand enough about English to use its structures correctly and logically. Finally, the aim should include a sense of responsibility for reading and a zest to know more thereby.[52]

Clearly it would be an irresponsible sham to ignore the necessity for the development of language skills to the attainment of the goals of higher education. It is also false, however, to assume that the attainment of the academic goals of higher education is reached equally by all graduates of even the same institution, and of course an even greater disparity exists between graduates of different institutions. A very important question in this regard is raised by Lawrence Howard, Director of the Institute on Human Relations at the University of Wisconsin. He asked, "Is the degree of language skill that is prerequisite for success in the general education requirements for college degree appropriate to the other requirements for a college degree?" He suggested that the upward economic and social mobility of the socio-economically disadvantaged might be enhanced if experimentation were attempted in the line of admitting and retaining students who did not attain sufficient verbal competence for the general education requirements but who would have sufficient ability to succeed in the major or professional requirements of their college degree. Such exceptions would extend to the ability examinations as well as to the particular course requirements.

He admitted such a proposal would have great difficulty being accepted by the faculty of any institution of higher education.[53] His suggestion is based, in part, on acceptance of the considerable research on intercorrelation of language, reading, and verbal skills to academic aptitude and admissions test scores and social class status.[54]

The very heavy dropout of students from lower socio-economic groups has been reported by Knoell.[55] Templin has pointed out the relationship of intelligence and socio-economic status to speech and language development.[56] Knapp studied the effect of time limits on the intelligence test performance of Mexican and American subjects.[57] Astin reported on personal and environmental factors associated with college dropouts among high aptitude students.[58] Sarnoff, Malleson, and Hopkins studied some non-intellectual correlates of success and failure among University students.[59] All of these studies contribute to the picture of the relationship of language ability, success in college, and scores on academic aptitude tests. In all cases, the disadvantaged student from lower socio-economic status is handicapped. For example, speed or timed tests appear to handicap Mexican students more than American students. Knapp reported, "The results indicated that while both the Mexican and American subjects scored higher under power conditions than under speed conditions, the difference was significantly greater for the Mexicans than for the Americans." [60] Since many of the admissions tests are timed and frequently are speed tests, this study has significance for consideration of acceptance of exceptions to admissions requirements.

The high proportion of dropouts among lower socio-economic status students was examined by Knoell. Even after borderline students from disadvantaged areas are admitted to higher education, they have considerable difficulty maintaining passing grades. Handicaps appear greatest in the areas related to language development.

Many attempts at remediation made by institutions of higher education appear to be successful in only a very small proportion of cases. Davis reported on cultural factors in remediation for younger students and found that the families, the community, the peer group, and the slum school all contribute to the problem.[61] The fact remains that a large proportion of students from disadvantaged areas who seek college admission lack academic, particularly language, skills that are necessary for entrance and success in institutions of higher education.

An increasing number of such students apply to the junior college. The problem for the junior colleges is not an easy one. On the one hand, most junior college administrators and faculty recognize the significant role the junior college can play in increasing the educational, economic, and cultural mobility of students from disadvantaged areas. They also recognize a responsibility to provide college programs, both in the transfer curricula and in the vocational and technical curricula, which meet appropriate standards of performance for institutions of higher education. The open door policy has been chided by some junior college people as a "revolving" door. The problem of making a significant contribution to the education of disadvantaged youth is a difficult one for all colleges, but many feel the junior college may be able to make the greatest contribution to success in lowering the academic barriers to higher education.

Meister and Tauber reported a program at Bronx Community College initiated in 1959 to attempt to meet the problem of expanding educational opportunity for the disadvantaged. They stated,

> The results of this 'open-door policy' have been several, among them an open door which becomes a revolving door because many students cannot measure up to the requirements of even the 'new' higher education. Lack of facilities sometimes results in the establishment of admissions requirements that serve not to admit but to reject. In the climate of necessity for 'Expanding Educational Opportunities for the Disadvantaged,' it is absolutely incumbent upon us to make more places available, at the same time protecting the integrity of the educational programs being offered and the standards in which they operate.[62]

A very serious part of the problem for the junior colleges is the concern of the faculty that incompetent students reduce the effectiveness of the instructor in teaching classes.

Richardson and Elsner stated,

> The junior college is torn between the necessity of maintaining standards to guarantee the employability and transferability of its graduates, and the knowledge that it constitutes the last opportunity for formal education some of its students will ever have. The problem of the marginal student is particularly acute in urban areas where poverty and de facto segregation generate discouraging numbers of educationally disadvantaged students who lack preparation for even the least rigorous technical programs offered by the junior college. Moreover, substantial numbers of these students fail to recognize their limitations and persist in enrolling in college transfer courses for status reasons to the mutual confoundment of themselves and their instructors.[63]

The junior colleges have made a number of attempts to meet this problem. As in the State Colleges and the University, they have instituted remedial courses. While the junior colleges appear more often to be able to obtain persons to teach such courses who do so voluntarily, the remedial course approach appears to be only a little more successful in the junior colleges than in the other institutions of higher education.

Richardson and Elsner concluded,

> Remedial courses do not meet the needs of the educationally disadvantaged.... The major achievement of developmental courses has been to produce a more homogeneous grouping in college transfer courses. . . . Although homogeneous grouping may improve the quality of transfer education no one has seriously asserted that such an approach will permit junior colleges to accomplish in one semester what public schools have failed to attain in twelve years. . . . [Remedial courses] fail utterly to meet the needs of the [disadvantaged group].[64]

The State Colleges and the University report no greater success with the use of remedial courses.

A second approach has been to provide a combination of remedial courses, special counseling, and make-up work in academic subjects. The goal of such programs has been to prepare students for entrance into the transfer program. Again, the percentage of success for such students is very small. Richardson and Elsner report, "As many as three out of every four who enter the program are doomed to failure."[65] Chicago Loop Junior College reported that about one per cent of students enrolled in such programs later succeeded in the transfer curriculum.[66] Many junior colleges have made concerted attempts to provide a combination of counseling, remedial program, and direction to the disadvantaged student so that he is made employable at a higher level of skill and economic return than would have been the case had he not attended the college. Status considerations appear to work contrary to the efforts of the junior college in working with such students. Students themselves resist the vocationally oriented junior college curricula.

Forest Park Community College of the Junior College District of St. Louis-St. Louis County has studied its provisions for educationally disadvantaged. They reported that for the fall semester of 1964, out of an enrollment of 1,501, 691 students, or forty-six per cent, had experienced academic difficulty; 278 of these students were placed on "enforced withdrawal"; 318 were placed on academic probation; 95 withdrew officially; and 85 simply stopped attending.[67] The program recommended by the faculty was designed to meet the following goals:

1. Meeting the needs of students in the lower range of the ability spectrum.
2. Improving standards in transfer courses by removing students incapable of making a contribution or of achieving significant benefit.
3. Providing educationally disadvantaged students with intensive counseling on an individual and group basis to:
    - (a) minimize emotional factors inhibiting success;
    - (b) aid students to assess realistically their potential and to relate this to vocational goals; and
    - (c) identify students incapable of benefiting from any college program and refer them to community resources through accurate and complete knowledge of apprenticeship requirements, job openings, training courses such as those sponsored by the Manpower Development and Training Act, as well as other community resources.
4. Salvaging the academically able students from this group who might be upgraded to the point where they could be successful in regular technical or transfer programs.[68]

The program designed by the college to meet these goals required the students be grouped into divisions of one hundred. To each such group a five-person team was assigned, consisting of one counselor, a reading specialist, and three representatives of academic divisions of the college.

> These considerations were central to planning the program: The curriculum should be concerned with broader development of the person . . . assist the student in coping with his environment . . . courses should be wider in scope, less fixed—their content should be drawn from many more facets of human problems and they should emphasize the individual student's needs.[69]

This quotation illustrates the difficulty the junior colleges have had, not just in California but throughout the United States, in meeting this complicated problem.

For the faculty members designing this program,

> It was obvious that the once-accepted criterion of success, admission to the college transfer program, would have to be shelved. No particular emphasis could be placed on keeping people in the program. If it were possible to counsel a student into an excellent job opportunity in March, why should the college regard his failure to complete the program as an indication of weakness in the program?[70]

While there is a great need to develop America's resources of specialized talent, the problem of reducing the academic admissions and language barriers for socio-economically disadvantaged youth is a particularly difficult one. The dilemma is best stated in the literature by two educators, both of whom have devoted much time and study to this problem. Wolfle has stated,

> The nation has an increasing need for many kinds of highly developed talent. Earlier in our history, the most critical need was for land for an expanding agriculture and then later for financial capital for

an expanding industry. But now the critical need is for men and women who can teach, who can roll back the boundaries of ignorance, who can manage complex organizations, who can perform the diverse and demanding tasks upon which the further development of a free, industrial society depends.[71]

Gardner, in his recent publication *Excellence—Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?* reported the following steps must be taken:

1. We must make available to young people far more information than they now have on post-high school opportunities other than college.
2. Parents, teachers and high school counselors must recognize that if the youngster who is not going to college is to continue his growth and learning he must receive as much sagacious help and counsel as a college-bound student.
3. We must do what we can to alter the negative attitude toward education held by many youngsters who fail to go on to college. They must understand that they have been exposed to only one kind of learning experience and that the failures and frustrations encountered in school are not necessarily predictive of failure in every other kind of learning.
4. We must enable the young person to understand that his stature as an individual and his value as a member of society depend upon continued learning—not just for four years or a decade, but throughout life.[72]

SUMMARY

These conclusions of Wolfle and Gardner pose the problem faced by those in higher education who want to increase opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students. Many steps can be taken to lower financial, geographic, motivational, and academic barriers. Many of these steps have already been taken by some higher education institutions in California. However, even if all of the programs, projects, and improvements that have been tried or proposed elsewhere were to be instituted in all of the colleges in the segments of higher education in California, some major barriers would still exist. Much more needs to be known about disadvantaged areas. The disciplines of economics, sociology, psychology, political science, law, health, medicine, social work, anthropology, criminology, education, and public administration need to undertake much more fundamental and interdisciplinary research for both the public schools and the colleges. Much more experimentation to develop more successful methods in the teaching of reading and language skills is particularly needed. With the tremendous intellectual resources of the University, the State Colleges, the Junior Colleges, and California's private colleges and universities, progress in these fundamental areas is possible.

SECTION II

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA*

In December 1963, the Regents, recognizing the interest of the University community and the need for financial support, allocated $100,000 for a Special Student Scholarship Fund, which would match on a one-to-one basis money raised by the campuses. This fund, which was later incorporated into Projects for Educational Opportunity, provided scholarships for promising disadvantaged high school students so that they might attend special educational programs on the campuses.

In October 1965, the Regents allocated $100,000 for 1965–66 and $200,000 for 1966–67 for Projects for Educational Opportunity, which provides matching funds on a five-to-one basis. Projects for Educational Opportunity are

> to provide funds (1) for educational opportunity awards to students from culturally disadvantaged groups to encourage these people to continue their education and to help them overcome obstacles along the way, and (2) to help support projects organized by students and faculty to identify, assist and motivate California high school students, who are members of culturally disadvantaged groups and who have demonstrated intellectual promise, to qualify for admission to the University.

In October 1965, the Regents also allocated $100,000 for 1965–66 and $200,000 for 1966–67 for the establishment of Community Service Project Offices to match on a two-to-one basis funds raised by the campuses. The purpose of the Community Service Project Offices is

> to provide funds to the several campuses for the establishment of offices designed to develop, maintain, and coordinate community service projects (student volunteer work in hospitals, local government, prisons, social welfare agencies, tutorial programs, etc.).

The admission policies of the University under the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education provide that two per cent of its undergraduate students may be admitted in exception to the general admission requirements. This two per cent exception enables the University to admit students who, though not able to meet the general requirements, indicate a potential for academic success. Adjustment to University life is difficult for the average student; for the student who is at a disadvantage because of his background, the problems of adjustment are multiplied. However, in conjunction with the tutorial and counseling programs now operating on various campuses, the two per cent rule is being used more extensively to aid the socio-economically disadvantaged.

RECRUITMENT OF SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Programs to recruit socio-economically disadvantaged students are both direct, as in the case of the Admissions Offices and various University schools and divisions, and indirect, as exemplified by faculty and student sponsored programs, which have as one of their major goals the encouragement of disadvantaged students to seek higher education.

Projects for Educational Opportunity. During the past two years, several campuses have developed educational opportunity programs. For the most part these programs were instituted by groups of faculty members concerned with bringing more minority group and socio-economically disadvantaged students into the University. Although these programs differ in detail, their aims are similar: to identify capable high school students who because of background disadvantages would not ordinarily pursue higher education; to assist these students through counseling and tutorial help to qualify for admission to universities and colleges; and to aid these students financially, emotionally, and academically during their college years.

The Committee on Special Scholarships at *Berkeley* originated the Special Opportunity Scholarship Program two years ago. This program seeks to encourage promising students to pursue a college education despite their disadvantaged background. Those selected for the program are brought to the campus each summer for approximately seven weeks, where they enroll in special classes taught by members of the faculty and outstanding Bay Area high school teachers. The students receive small stipends to compensate for the loss of summer earnings. During the school year the program is continued with regular tutorial sessions and on-campus classes. The current group of students is comprised of 75 high school juniors and seniors, representing eleven East Bay schools; from 75 to 80 per cent of the students are from minority groups. There is reasonable expectation that many of these students will choose the University at some time in their academic careers. The Special Opportunity Scholarship Program is supported in great part by funds donated by the faculty. The committee is now seeking additional funds to support those students from the program who will be entering Berkeley as regular students in the fall of 1966.

---

* Most of this section was provided by Dean William F. Shepard, Associate University Dean for Institutional Relations.

This program gives evidence of providing secondary benefits, in that other students from disadvantaged backgrounds are learning of the University's interest in them. At the time the second group of participants was selected, there were more volunteers than could be accommodated. Many minority group individuals within the community have learned of the program and they, as well as the parents, are actively encouraging these and other students. Extensive contacts have been made with high school administrators, counselors, and teachers in the search for participants. During the process, many other students have been "discovered" and, although they have not been eligible for the program, have been aided in their efforts to make college and university attendance a reality.

On the *Davis* campus, the objective of the faculty-sponsored Educational Aid Program is to identify creative and able high school and junior college students who are not motivated to obtain a degree because of their ethnic or cultural background. The program has two basic phases. The first is to recruit students who are currently eligible to attend the University. The faculty committee has awarded three full-support scholarships for the spring semester 1966; all three students were admitted under the two per cent exception rule. The committee is committed to the full or partial support of these students as long as they continue to meet the University's scholarship requirements. The number of students participating in this program will increase each year as additional funds become available. Two of the students currently sponsored transferred to Davis from junior colleges, and one entered directly from high school.

The second phase of the Education Aid Program deals with high school students from disadvantaged backgrounds. These students will come to the Davis campus during the summer to participate in what is designed to be a cultural enrichment program with an academic core. This phase of the program will be initiated this summer with 15 to 20 students and will continue with as many more students each summer as funds allow.

The Jordan High Seool Project, sponsored by the Academic Senate at *University of California at Los Angeles*, was organized by faculty members in the spring of 1964. In the fall of that year, Saturday morning tutorials were instituted with a staff of approximately twelve faculty members and ten UCLA students. Approximately twenty-one junior and senior students from Jordan High School in Watts were given small scholarships and were transported to the Los Angeles campus each Saturday morning. Most ordinarily would not have qualified for admission to a college or university. Of the twenty-one, six graduated from high school in February 1965. Two of these entered UCLA and completed their first semester satisfactorily. Two others entered junior colleges. This year the number of students in the program was doubled.

The *Riverside* Educational Opportunity Program is in its first year. Five Mexican-American students were recruited from local high schools and are now in their freshman year. One was admitted under the two per cent rule.

At the *San Diego* campus a Special Job and Scholarship Opportunity Program was established in the summer of 1965. Ten students from local high schools, centered in areas heavily populated by minority groups and low-income families, were given full-time summer jobs and received scholarships that paid full support during the first quarter and the incidental fee and board and room for the remaining two quarters. Savings from summer earnings would pay personal expenses during the last two quarters should a student be unable to carry a work load in addition to his studies. (The students were not permitted to work during the first quarter.) All but two of the students were from minority groups.

In most cases, the students were placed in summer jobs related to their career aims. One student lived on campus during the summer; the others commuted in University-arranged transportation. All participated in individual tutoring sessions in the Humanities and achieved satisfactory grades in Subject A (from which two were exempt) and the Humanities sequence. The students did not fare as well, however, in mathematics. Even those who had been outstanding mathematics students in high school received low grades. (This, incidentally, was also the experience of many students not in the special scholarship program.) One student, a Caucasian, dropped out for personal reasons. Three of the group are now employed under the Work-Study Program from six to ten hours per week. All nine receive counseling and special tutoring as needed.

Other Recruitment. It is in the area of recruitment of minority group and socio-economically disadvantaged students by administrative offices and academic divisions of the University that the greatest need for coordination is felt. A University-wide conference on the subject was held recently in Los Angeles, and the Office of the University Dean of Educational Relations has been designated to disseminate information and coordinate programs. Some of the campus recruitment activities are described below.

Several of the schools at *Berkeley* have begun active recruitment of minority group students at both the undergraduate and graduate level. For the 1965 fall semester, ten students were recruited by the School of Criminology, eighteen by the School of Social Welfare, and eighteen by the School of Education.

In addition, the Dean of the Graduate Division has made several direct efforts at recruiting minority group students, but thus far has achieved only slight success. It is felt that until greater financial aids such as tuition waivers and *fellowships* are available (especially for men and women returning from the work force), successful recruitment will be minimal.

The College of Letters and Science, the *Admissions* Officer, and a representative of the Office of Relations with Schools obtained from local high school and junior college counselors the names of thirty-four Negro students who, although not admissible under the general admission rules, showed considerable promise. Through the efforts of this group, who worked with a special assistant to the Chancellor, eighteen students were registered for the spring semester 1966. The University YMCA provided funds (matched by the Projects for Educational Opportunity fund on a five-to-one basis) to meet the minimal expenses of the program, and housing was furnished by the University Students Cooperative Association. The students will receive extensive counseling and tutoring by members of the faculty and fellow students.

In January 1966, a full-time Assistant in Charge of Special Projects was appointed to the staff of the Berkeley Chancellor. Creation of this new position will make it possible for the campus to proceed vigorously in the recruitment of minority group students, to extend programs now in operation and develop new projects, and to coordinate current and future endeavors in this area.

The *Admissions* Officer at *Davis* is working with the National Achievement Scholarship Program in the recruitment of outstanding Negro students. Invitations were issued for seven such students to apply for the current spring semester. Davis plans to continue this activity in future terms.

At the *University of California at Los Angeles* an Educational Opportunities Office serving several functions has been established. Together with the Associated Students, it has worked with predominantly Negro and Mexican-American secondary schools in the area in attracting to UCLA students who are both talented and likely to be of service to their communities in the future. The Office also has served as a follow-up agency with respect to superior students who are participating in the Academic Senate and Medical School programs. In the spring of 1965 an initial group of thirty-three students was brought to UCLA under the auspices of the Educational Opportunity Program. They were provided with special counseling and with grants to assist them in meeting the cost of their education. The experience of the first semester was extremely encouraging, with the academic record of these higher than the average for entering freshmen.

Various schools within the campus have recruitment programs. For example, the School of Medicine has instituted a program of summer laboratory work for selected minority group high school students. Last year four Negro and two Mexican-American students were provided with eight weeks of laboratory work at a salary of $65 per week. Each student was assigned a faculty sponsor and graduate medical student with whom he worked. Student reports indicate that the program was successful in encouraging them to consider careers in the field of medicine. The program will be expanded next year.

Two years ago the Los Angeles Graduate Division initiated a program to recruit students from Negro colleges in the South, as well as students from the Los Angeles area, who were runners-up in the Woodrow Wilson *Foundation* competition. The students were given financial and other assistance. However, the drop-out rate indicates that the program must be revised if it is to succeed.

Although the predominantly graduate character of the *San Francisco* campus precludes recruitment of students directly from high school, a pilot program conducted last spring was quite successful in interesting disadvantaged students in careers in the health sciences. *Faculty* committees planned and supervised a series of ten one-hour orientation meetings at San Francisco's Galileo High School, which has a student body that is over fifty per cent Oriental. A total of 136 students attended the meetings. The recruiting teams felt sufficiently enthusiastic about the project to hold another series at Polytechnic High School, which has a student body that is more than fifty per cent Negro. A series of seventeen sessions has just been completed there, attended by over 500 students.

The Ad Hoc Committee for Scholarship Aid for Underprivileged Students plans to select a number of promising students for individual attention and encouragement. These students, to be chosen jointly by representatives from the Medical Center and from area high schools, will be invited to one-day seminars and tours of the San Francisco campus. Summer scholarships and part-time work for these disadvantaged students is being considered also.

The Dean of Students at *Santa Barbara* is chairman of a committee engaged in an experiment designed to recruit outstanding Negro students now enrolled in segregated high schools in the South. The program has been expanded to include American Indian youths attending reservation schools, and the aid of VISTA volunteers working on reservations has been sought. Applicants from the Northern Cheyenne tribe are currently under consideration. This program will include University student participation as "big brothers" and "big sisters," faculty participation as special counselors, enrollment of the recruited student in "Reading-Study Clinics," reserved spaces in residence halls, and special group counseling by the campus Counseling Center.

The Dean of Students, together with staff from the University-wide Office of Relations with Schools, also is meeting with the Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission and selected principals and counselors from the Los Angeles Mid-City high schools, most of which are located in Watts, in an effort to recruit members of minority groups. It is hoped that these meetings will result in visits to these schools, and their feeder junior high schools, by Negro-student speakers from the Santa Barbara campus. The Associated Students organization is assisting in this project.

The Dean of Students also is in communication with the San Francisco Negro Labor Council to the end that similar programs can be established in the Bay Area. Letters have been written to all the National Achievement Scholarship finalists who reside in California inviting them to enroll to Santa Barbara. Preliminary estimates of the success of this latter program indicate that the present Negro student population will increase by six times by the opening of the 1966 fall quarter. A significant increase already has occurred in the current spring term enrollment.

OFF-CAMPUS TUTORIAL PROJECTS

Tutorial projects have been developed primarily by students and student organizations. Although some work is done at the high school level, most of the tutoring activity is at the elementary school level, for this is where motivation must be stimulated if the disadvantaged student is to achieve his educational potential.

The Student Tutorial Aid Group at *Berkeley* is composed of University students, the majority of whom are Negro, and works with Negro students in the Berkeley High School. Its purposes are to interest Negro students in, and encourage them to qualify for, admission to the Berkeley campus and to develop in them an appreciation and respect for the heritage, culture, and history of the American Negro. STAG conducts tutorial sessions both on the campus and in the high schools and arranges social, cultural, and other educational activities for the students.

The UC Tutorial Project is sponsored by the Associated Students. The group, racially mixed but largely Caucasian, works with elementary and junior high school students in West Oakland. Most of these students will evetually attend McClymonds High School (90 per cent Negro) from which the Special Opportunity Scholarship Program draws some of its students.

The Cal Aggie Study Center Project at *Davis* has been in operation for two years. Originally initiated by individual students in conjunction with Sacramento welfare agencies, it is now an Associated Students program involving more than 250 Davis students. These students travel to study centers in Sacramento on a regular schedule to tutor elementary and high school students who wish assistance. The centers are located in low-income areas of the city, and the students in attendance are predominantly from minority group and/or socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds. An additional tutoring center in Woodland, Yolo County, is being planned.

The Cal Aggie Christian Association operates two tutorial programs. The first, Help, is conducted in Yolando Park, a county low-cost housing project in the Woodland area. In operation for two years, Help has a staff of twelve Davis students. The second project, Challenge, is centered in the Davis area and works with underachievers on a one-to-one basis. Approximately twelve Davis students participate in this counseling and tutorial program, which is in its early stages. Project leaders plan for perhaps twice this number in the immediate future.

The Neighborhood Tutorial Program has over fifty student volunteers from the *University of California at Irvine* who serve at least one afternoon a week in nearby Santa Ana and Atwood tutorial centers. This program has provided the impetus for the formation of a larger student organization entitled UCI Community Action, whose program is now being organized.

The *University of California at Los Angeles* Tutorial Project, sponsored by the Associated Students, was begun in the summer of 1963 with sixty tutors and eighty counselees. By June 1965, there were 575 tutors and 750 counselees, ranging in age from eight to eighteen and mostly of Negro and Mexican-American descent. In addition to tutoring services, the project offers an enrichment program of trips and other activities, which exposes the counselees to new people and places. The success of this project has been instrumental in the establishment of more than thirty similar programs in the Los Angeles area, and it is believed that its influence is only beginning to spread.

The *University of California at Riverside* Tutorial Project involves some 225 students who tutor in five schools—one high school, one junior high school, and three elementary schools. A substantial number of the children tutored are from minority groups. This year tutorial services have been extended to children in the Sherman Indian Institute.

A tutorial program sponsored by the Associated Students at *Santa Barbara* is now in its third year. Approximately 200 student tutors are working with socio-economically disadvantaged students and potential high school dropouts. Students work in the City and County of Santa Barbara; expenses are paid by the Associated Students.

Santa Cruz has already established a pilot tutorial program, although the campus is only in its first year of operation. Fifty of its six hundred students work on a one-to-one basis with elementary school children from the surrounding area. The children are bussed to the Santa Cruz campus on Saturday mornings for tutoring, enrichment activities, and lunch with their tutors. Program leaders hope to expand these activities and increase the number of participating students.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION PROJECTS

Many of the projects in this category bear only an indirect relationship to the recruitment of students but are included in this report because they have a positive effect on the number of *disadvantaged* students seeking admission to institutions of higher learning, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

At *Berkeley* the University YMCA (Stiles Hall) has over 300 University students currently working in a variety of projects designed to upgrade the educational aspirations and capacities of socio-economically disadvantaged youth. These include the Student West Oakland Project (tutoring, teachers' aides, adventure tours), the Berkeley Big Brother Project (one-to-one companionships with Police Juvenile Bureau boys), Interpersonal Relations Project (one-to-one companionships with fifth and sixth grade emotionally troubled boys, not all of whom are disadvantaged), One-to-one Project (tutoring, language aid, and recreation with Spanish-speaking youth), Juvenile Hall Project (tutoring), San Quentin Project (tutoring, classroom teaching) Youth Corps Project (one-to-one companionships with high potential corps members), and assistance the recruiting of School Resource Volunteers. In addition, Stiles Hall has recruited four special action students for the spring semester 1966 and has secured matching funds from the Regents program for nineteen students.

The University YWCA has, as one of its major programs, Project Motivation, which has involved approximately 300 school children and 200 University students over the past four years. This program emphasizes adventure and discovery tours for fifth and sixth grade children. Visits are made to the University campus, the State Capitol, newspaper plants, police departments, beaches, parks, etc. Groups of six to eight children and two or three adults make three to four trips each semester. Children enroll in the program for two years.

Also, in cooperation with the Oakland Community YWCA, the University YWCA tutors pregnant teenage girls unable to attend school, and works with girls who are on probation or who have dropped out of school. YWCA volunteers work in Berkeley public schools in various capacities, including individual tutoring and in neighborhood YMCA centers, primarily in Negro areas, as leaders in social, cultural, and educational programs for small groups of teenagers.

Last semester a pre-school tutorial program was established with twenty University students working with children on a one-to-one basis. The child is recommended for the program by the West Berkeley School Department. The tutor meets with the parents of the child and then spends at least two hours each week with the child in informal activities aimed at improving his basic concepts. This semester there are forty student tutors in the program. A conservative estimate indicates that the YWCA's programs each semester affect about 450 socio-economically disadvantaged children, ranging from pre-school to high school age.

School Resource Volunteers (SRV) is a community-based program that depends largely upon University student volunteers to assist in Berkeley schools in a number of capacities. Over 300 students participate in the program each year. The University YMCA and YWCA have assumed responsibility for on-campus recruiting of volunteers.

Project SEED (Special Elementary Education for the Disadvantaged) has been developed over the last two years in three elementary schools in the Berkeley poverty area. Teachers in these schools identify four or five students from each class with good academic potential. Those selected are then grouped into ten accelerated classes of twenty-five students each, to which volunteer graduate students from the Berkeley campus bring the new and exciting discovery method of learning mathematics. The graduate students are supervised by the Master Teacher who developed this method of teaching.

The Committee on Special Scholarships at Berkeley believes that SEED has proven in its experimental phase that special work in mathematics with younger disadvantaged children helps to overcome their low self-image and increases educational motivation, as well as improving other learning processes. If sufficient financial support is forthcoming, the committee plans to sponsor the SEED program as part of its total endeavors. If the program can be financed, both mathematics and foreign language will be part of the SEED curriculum, and the number of elementary school children involved may increase to as many as six hundred.

SEED will provide a means of identifying disadvantaged elementary school children who show promise. They would subsequently be funneled into a junior high school "discovery" program and from there into the Special Opportunity Scholarship Program. Ultimately these students will be top quality candidates for higher education.

Members of the *UCLA* student body volunteer to speak at area high schools that are predominantly Negro and Mexican-American, informing the students of scholarships and grants available from funds collected by the Associated Students and matched by the Regents. As part of the Associated Students' recruitment program, campus tours and visits are arranged for minority group students.

ON-CAMPUS STUDENT SERVICES

The number of socio-economically disadvantaged students enrolled in the University is as yet relatively small, and programs designed specifically to assist them in adjusting to the demands of university life are not as numerous as those aimed at their recruitment. Most campuses, however, do have established programs to assist any student experiencing financial, academic, or emotional difficulties: counseling centers, job placement centers, scholarship offices, student health centers, deans' offices, etc.

Financial Aid. Of special interest in this area of assistance are the efforts being made by the campuses under the Work-Study Program. The federally subsidized Work-Study Program, aimed at assisting the student from the low-income family, is of great value to the student body. Student employment provided under this program need be concerned with social service or be directly related to the educational goals of the student. Most of the campuses of the University have been quick to take advantage of the opportunities provided.

At *Berkeley*, 636 students are currently employed in positions created under the Work-Study Program. There are 434 students employed in on-campus jobs, serving between sixty and seventy separate University hiring entities, and 202 students working in the community in a total of fifty different agencies.

The *Davis* campus will inaugurate its Work-Study Program with the spring semester of 1966, and student applications are now being accepted. It is estimated that a total of 400 students will be eligible for jobs. To date, University departments have created 370 jobs, and off-campus non-profit organizations have created eighteen jobs.

In January 1966, *Irvine* received a federal grant of over $40,000 to support a Work-Study Program providing some eighty jobs. Job candidates are now being interviewed by various departments, and the Office of Financial Aids is certifying the eligibility of these students.

At *UCLA* one hundred Negro and fifty Mexican-American students are participating currently in the Work-Study Program, which provides jobs for approximately 700 students.

At *Riverside* some eighty-seven students have been involved in the Work-Study Program; approximately seventy-seven students are from minority groups.

At *San Diego* thirty students are participating in the Work-Study Program, and every effort is being made to recruit more eligible students through local service agencies.

The *San Francisco* campus plans to employ between sixty and one hundred students under the Work-Study Program during the spring semester. Should the initial venture prove successful, the number of students would be doubled during the 1966–67 fiscal year.

At *Santa Barbara* the Work-Study Program currently provides jobs for 155 students. The number of jobs available is expected to triple under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Santa Cruz is filling fifty jobs created under the Work-Study Program. About half of these jobs involve students in a close association with faculty members in a recently established "Faculty-Aide Program."

Counseling Services. The campuses have tutorial and counseling services available to all students, and those campuses which have programs related to the Projects for Educational Opportunity have instituted special counseling and tutorial programs for the disadvantaged student.

The *Berkeley* Honor Students Society offers tutorial service to any University student requesting academic help. Last year 250 student tutors contributed 9,000 hours of tutorial service.

The Faculty Committee on Special Scholarships has established a group of *Faculty Friends*, who work with students from minority backgrounds. Under this program, a faculty member establishes an informal relationship with a student and offers him counsel on any personal or academic problem he may have. The program is rapidly expanding in anticipation of a considerable increase in the number of disadvantaged students enrolled at Berkeley. Faculty interest in the program is high.

Study-skills classes at *Davis* are held each semester under the direction of the Counseling Center and are open to all students. Approximately two hundred students take advantage of these classes each semester.

The Associated Students at *Los Angeles* recently established a Campus Adviser Program. Tutorial help is provided, but the major aim of the program is to provide for the new undergraduate the encouragement and guidance of a "seasoned veteran." Approximately thirty-four new undergraduates are receiving this assistance currently.

A committee of the Academic Senate also is working with disadvantaged students at Los Angeles. A request to the faculty to act as counselors to these students produced an overwhelming response—more than 300 volunteered. One faculty member was selected for each student in his special field of interest. The results of the program have been very encouraging.

On the *Riverside* campus the Office of the Dean of the College of Letters and Science is providing special counseling for the Mexican-American students enrolled under the Educational Opportunity Scholarship Program.

The ten students attending *San Diego* under the Special Job and Scholarship Opportunity Program received individual tutoring during the summer to prepare them for the humanities course sequence. For the fall term they were assigned individual advisers and have received special tutoring in any subject in which they experienced difficulty.

At *Santa Barbara* volunteer faculty members counsel disadvantaged students, entertain them in faculty homes, and in general, provide far more than the usual student-faculty relationship. A group of Santa Barbara students serve, on a one-to-one basis, as "big brothers" and "big sisters" and provide a meaningful and continuing orientation experience for these students.

FUTURE PROGRAMS PLANNED FOR SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

In November 1965 a committee of faculty members at *Berkeley* was appointed by the Chancellor to advise him on the staff required to develop and coordinate programs for disadvantaged students. The committee has met several times, has reviewed current programs, and has just submitted its recommendations. As a result of the Regents' $100,000 allocation for Community Service Project Offices, several additional student projects are being formulated.

The Counseling Center at *Davis* is studying a program that would train students to serve as peer models for new undergraduates who might have trouble adjusting socially and academically.

The Office of the Dean of Students and the Associated Students are planning an on-campus center to maintain and coordinate all community service projects. Initial planning indicates that seven community programs would be coordinated immediately through this central office. An application for matching funds from the Community Service Project Fund is being prepared.

The Cal Aggie Christian Association and the interfraternity Council propose to sponsor a "Big Brother" program for boys from families where the father is absent. Students would also work with pre-delinquent boys referred through the County juvenile authorities. At least twenty students are expected to participate during the first year of the program working on a one-to-one basis.

UCI Community Action, a student organization now being formed, has several programs tentatively scheduled. It has as one of its main purposes the extension of the Neighborhood Tutorial Program, which is now carried out in conjunction with existing programs in Orange County. Also planned is the development of UCI tutorials for students making the transition from high school to college life and a summer institute to encourage able but disadvantaged students to enter college.

The *Riverside* campus is exploring the possibility of establishing a Head Start Playground-Tutorial Program that would be staffed jointly by college and high school students from minority groups.

San Diego hopes to add fifteen incoming freshmen to its Special Job and Scholarship Opportunity Program. Under consideration is the possibility of having the students live on campus for twelve weeks during the summer, with six weeks being spent in intensive mathematics and humanities instruction and the other six in working.

New approaches are being planned at *San Francisco* that will: (1) encourage disadvantaged youth to enter the health sciences, (2) improve communications between educational groups and minority communities, and (3) establish a working relationship with community service organizations. A community services unit to accomplish these objectives will be established in the Office of the Dean of Students.

The Associated Students at *Santa Barbara* have created a new Community Service Board to develop a wide variety of programs that will take advantage of the matching funds made available by the Regents. Students have held a series of meetings with the leaders of existing programs in the surrounding area to determine where their services would be of greatest value.

The following proposals are currently under consideration by the Santa Barbara administration:

1. Provision of adequate funds so that financially needy students from socio-economically disadvantaged families can be, where appropriate, provided with salaried tutors and enrolled in "Reading-Study Clinics." Most campuses offer these clinics through the Extension Division. Fees for the clinics could come from the funds mentioned above.
2. Reserving space in University residence halls for at least a limited number of these students, hopefully beginning in the fall of 1966.
3. Increasing the effectiveness of existing financial aids by creating tailor-made financial aid packages for disadvantaged students.
4. Expanding current programs designed to assist disadvantaged students, particularly in the areas of faculty-student relationships, the "big brother" and "big sister" activities, and group counseling.

The faculty and students of the *Santa Cruz* campus want to establish additional programs of assistance as rapidly as possible. They would like to add to their staff a full-time person whose activities would embrace coordination of financial aids, school visitations and participation in counseling, development of special institutional programs such as language training and summer institutes, and coordination of student and staff participation in community service programs.

SUMMARY

In a questionnaire sent to the campuses, a request was made for recommendations as to how best the University-wide administration could help the campuses in their efforts to aid the socio-economically disadvantaged. Many of the answers were so similar in tone that they are listed here in general terms:

1. Financial support (additional scholarship funds and tuition waivers for those not ordinarily qualified).

2. University-wide assistance by the Office of Relations with Schools and the alumni associations in campus recruitment efforts.
3. Clear definition and communication as to what offices and personnel are to represent the University-wide administration in this area.
4. A University-wide conference on assisting the socio-economically disadvantaged.
5. Assurance that policies will be long term and that matching funds will continue to be available.
6. The designation of a University-wide office to act as a clearing house for the sharing of information.

The Office of Relations with Schools is increasing its efforts to assist the campuses in recruiting disadvantaged sudents, and the alumni associations are being asked to cooperate in these endeavors. A University-wide conference on tutorial projects has just been held, and plans are under way for a conference on aiding the socio-economically disadvantaged. The Associate University Dean of Educational Relations has been designated as the individual to work with the campuses in this area.

Most of the special programs in operation on each of the several campuses of the University have been designed and put into effect by students and faculty. Their initiative, enthusiasm, and creativity have been remarkable. It is apparent, however, that the Opportunity Grants and Scholarships allocated by the Regents and the University-wide administration have stimulated much more effort in behalf of disadvantaged students than would otherwise have been possible. By providing the monies for these programs on a matching basis and allowing each campus to devise its own program, the University has inaugurated many programs with real promise of success.

The dynamic character of the response of the campuses to the Regents' challenge is exemplified in the number of programs for disadvantaged students that have been initiated on the campuses, even while this survey was under way. Programs that were originally reported as planned were later reported in operation, and new programs unreported at the beginning of the year are now in final planning stages. The assignment of administrative responsibility and the recent University-wide conference are steps that should result in a continuation of a leadership role for the University in efforts to increase opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students.

SECTION III

THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

Several developments during the past year have indicated systemwide concern among the State Colleges for instituting or improving programs for disadvantaged students. A report on Compensatory Education was recently published by the Academic Planning Division of the Chancellor's Office. They also published a report on the Programs for the Culturally Disadvantaged sponsored by the State Colleges in the Los Angeles area. The State Colleges, in cooperation with the State Board of Education and the California Teachers' Association, sponsored a conference in late spring of 1965 on compensatory education and higher education provisions for disadvantaged students. Following this conference, a statewide committee on compensatory education was appointed by the Chancellor.

The Academic Senate for the California State Colleges passed a resolution in the spring of 1965 suggesting that special exceptions to admissions standards be used, particularly for disadvantaged students. This resolution indicated that each college should develop its own definition of disadvantaged student and then keep track of the use of exceptions for this purpose. By this resolution, each college was to report to the statewide Dean of Institutional Relations and Student Affairs at the end of the year on the use of the rule on exceptions. None of the State Colleges has reported making any exceptions specifically for disadvantaged students to the regular admissions requirements under the existing two per cent rule.

RECRUITMENT OF SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

A number of the State Colleges have made provisions to increase opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students. One of the activities to which a good deal of emphasis has been given is the area of student recruitment. Several of the colleges have taken active steps to provide students from disadvantaged areas with increased information of the opportunities in higher education. They have actively recruited students to come to the colleges and, in several ways, have increased the likelihood of success for the student in meeting the admissions requirements for the college.

At *San Fernando Valley State College* representatives from the Counseling and Testing Office are participating in the Pacoima Community Program which includes searching out those eligible for assistance under the program for socio-economically disadvantaged students. The program is designed to enable bright children to be identified early and brought to campus for special event programs. The college is represented at all the meetings of the Pacoima Community Welfare Committee by a staff member from the Counseling and Testing Office working closely with the Pacoima Center.

California State College at Dominguez Hills has publicized in local newspapers the opportunities available through the Work-Study Program. Also, several of the welfare agencies have worked with the college to get this information to the southwest Los Angeles area.

Chico State College has used its regular *Newsletter* to high school and junior college counselors to urge them to refer socio-economically disadvantaged students to the college for specialized counseling. In addition, special advertisements have urged prospective students to utilize the Work-Study Program. The Dean of Students has also made it a practice to write personal letters to Negro students who are academically eligible, encouraging them to apply for admission and describing the financial aids program.

California State Polytechnic College at Pomona uses its bulletin, "Notes for Counselors," as well as special recruiting trips to local "feeder" high schools, to publicize the opportunities for special counseling and financial aid for students in disadvantaged areas.

Sacramento State College has initiated a program of search for talented disadvantaged youth with the principals in the high schools in the Sacramento State College area. The college keeps the representative designated by the principal completely informed of the services available for both financial and counseling aid for students who need help, particularly those with high potential but inadequate financial resources to support college attendance.

San Diego State College has a faculty speakers bureau that meets with groups in the low-income sections of the city to discuss the possibilities of scholarships, loans, and careers.

California State College at Long Beach has arranged tours of the campus for the sixth grade classes from the socio-economically disadvantaged areas of Long Beach to give these children a view of college classroom activities and to encourage them to look ahead and plan for continuing their education. This college project is known as "Operation Horizon."

San Francisco State College has arranged orientation meetings for counselors in those high schools which do not ordinarily produce college oriented students in significant numbers. The goal has been to explain the financial aids available to students who discount college for financial reasons. The Admissions Officer is participating in a pilot study set up by the College Entrance Examination Board and visits high schools in the low-economic areas to talk with students about college and to try to eliminate some of the misconceptions about college enrollment.

Fresno State College has developed a College Assistance Program which has established a regular counseling schedule in high schools in its service area. The Admissions Officer and the Financial Aids Officer, acting as a team, meet on a bi-weekly basis with students in high schools in the Fresno area. They explain the complete financial aids program—including the Work-Study Program, loan program, and scholarship program.

They also have made direct contacts with disadvantaged youth who have been recommended to the college by their high school counselors or teachers. The program has been particularly effective at Edison High School area in Fresno where a high percentage of Mexican, Negro, and Oriental families reside. This college motivation program was developed jointly with the counselors from Edison High School and was patterned after that of the National Scholarship Service and the Fund for Negro Students. Approximately one hundred Edison High School freshmen identified as youth with academic potential by "feeder" elementary schools are participating in this program during the current year. It is planned that after a four-year period, when the program is fully implemented, approximately five hundred youth at four different levels of the high schools in the Fresno area will be participating, with help from Fresno State College.

California State College at Los Angeles has developed a student recruitment program directly related to the placement of its student teachers in the schools of the disadvantaged areas near the college. The student teachers refer to the college faculty students who appear to have college potential, but are not presently college oriented. The faculty members and counselors in the Admissions Office arrange invitations for these students to come in groups to visit the college.

OFF-CAMPUS TUTORIAL PROJECTS

Among the most promising developments in the State Colleges is the special off-campus tutoring program that is sponsored by the California State College Student Presidents Association and carried out through student government on each campus. In this program college students tutor disadvantaged students at the high school or junior high school level with the particular objective of helping these students with their studies and orienting them toward the achievement of higher education. This program has been organized almost entirely by the students, although faculty and administrative cooperation is freely given whenever sought. Three of the State Colleges have been particularly active in this regard—Fresno State College, California State College at Los Angeles, and San Francisco State College.

Fresno State College has a program now involving ninety college students sponsored entirely by the Associated Students. College students tutor students in Fresno elementary and high schools on a one-to-one relationship. The goal of this tutoring is to increase motivation for further education, as well as to provide help with the development of academic skills that are needed for academic success. Student volunteers spend one hour, twice weekly, in actual tutoring; including the travel time most of the students are contributing about five hours a week. The tutors also meet with the parents of the child they are tutoring and try to enlist the parents' aid in increasing the student's desire to learn. A number of the tutors have been bringing the students on campus and taking them on educational field trips as a part of a general cultural enrichment program.

In addition, two students have set up a special art project in the Community Center, so that special art lessons can be given to students from disadvantaged areas. Six Fresno State College students serve in the Community Center on Saturday mornings to help students with their homework, and eight volunteer students provide secretarial help and serve on the telephone committee for the program. The project is offered in elementary schools, one high school, and the Community Center. The president of the Associated Students appoints a chairman for each of the three projects. The chairman's job is to manage affairs of his project, including assigning of tutors, arranging car pools, and checking on tutor-tutee attendance. The chairman also works closely with the principal and teachers to assure that the project runs smoothly. The Student Council has provided the group with $500 to finance the program for the school year 1965–66; a major portion of this money goes for clerical help to publish bulletins and materials to be used directly with the children. The students have called their program "Operation Catch-Up," and while it facilitates the recruitment work of the Student Personnel staff, the project is run entirely by the students.

The administrative project and the student project cooperate in the sponsoring of the "College Prep Club" that has been initiated at a high school in the heart of the disadvantaged area. This Prep Club is one result of twice-a-week meetings that the Student Personnel staff has with students in the high school. Some of these high school students are the ones getting help from the tutors.

California State College at Los Angeles students are involved in several tutorial projects. One of these is the study project done cooperatively with the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of Southern California, and two Junior Colleges through the parish of East Los Angeles. The program involves special tutoring for slow readers, tutoring on specific subjects, particularly at the high school level, help with homework for students, directed library visits, and establishment of a close personal relationship between the college student and the student receiving the tutoring. The Associated Students supports additional tutoring projects, both in the Mexican-American communities and the Negro areas of Los Angeles.

San Francisco State College has a well organized tutorial program administered entirely by the students that involves three hundred college students giving off-campus tutoring help on a one-to-one basis with students from disadvantaged areas. In addition, working cooperatively with the San Francisco Board of Education, the students developed an arrangement whereby they bring high school problem students to San Francisco State College. The college students provide, on a one-to-one basis, a companion to take these students through a day of college life, acquainting them with various aspects of the college, including financial aid available, and encouraging the development of some personal correspondence with the students. This is in addition to a very active community involvement program that has been developed by the San Francisco State students.

California State College at Fullerton participates in a countywide tutorial program, using student volunteers.

The Associated Students at *California State College at Long Beach* has established a Human Relations Commission that sponsors a tutorial project. The Commission has the function of recruiting tutors to work with socio-economically disadvantaged students in public schools and maintaining liaison with the Community Improvement League regarding recruitment and orientation of tutors and participation of students. Sixty students presently participate in this program.

At *San Diego State College* both the College YMCA and YWCA have sponsored for the last two years a tutorial program for eighty-five disadvantaged students in junior and senior high schools.

Sacramento State College has had a voluntary tutorial program for several years where up to two hundred college students have contributed their time in study centers. It is aimed directly at the socio-economically disadvantaged areas.

California State Polytechnic College at Pomona has approximately fifty college students now serving as tutors on a one-to-one basis with fifty high school students. This is an Associated Students activity that is advised by college faculty members.

At *San Fernando Valley State College* the Associated Students Tutorial Society sends members off campus to work with disadvantaged students. Approximately forty-five Tutorial Society members worked with disadvantaged students during the fall 1965 semester. Much of the work is carried on at Maclay Junior High School in Pacoima.

At *Chico State College* the Associated Students operates a tutorial program to serve grade school children living within the Chico Unified School District. A student committee recruits and screens the student volunteers. Those selected meet one or two hours twice a week with each child to be tutored.

Of the sixteen State Colleges reporting, ten have established tutorial programs. Each of these programs is sponsored and administered by the students. In most cases, the program is operated cooperatively with surrounding school districts. While there are no studies of the improvement in achievement of those being tutored, the reports from the college students indicate that the motivation, as well as the ability, of the students being tutored has increased. The "models" provided to disadvantaged students by these college students, who show a keen interest in community improvement and in the progress of the student being tutored, appear to be effective. It remains to be seen whether the number of students from disadvantaged areas attempting college and succeeding will be increased as a result of these efforts. However, it should be noted that the value of such educationally oriented human relations programs cannot be measured solely by statistical results.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION PROJECTS

San Francisco State College has a highly developed student program for helping disadvantaged youth. The tutorial project was initiated three years ago by the student body and now involves not only the three hundred students in the tutorial program, but also fifty students in a Community Involvement Program. This project takes college student volunteers and gives them an opportunity to work from three to five hours a week with minority groups in Negro and Oriental sections of San Francisco.

An excerpt from a report by San Francisco State College students in October, 1965, is relevant:

> CIP was begun in the faith that a new student generation is developing across the country, as well as at San Francisco State College. This seems to be a student that characterizes the best of our cultural values, serious commitment towards a quality of life for all people and thoughtful, decisive action against inequities that may affect a few people but indirectly affects us all. Moreover, we feel that all students are seeking ways to make their studies directly applicable to real situations or overcome

> the varieties of pressures that entice us to use education for interests that neglect fundamental social needs. CIP does not pretend to represent world-saving truths, but is committed to serve people who want to work together across the supposed boundaries of differences.

Students participating in the Community Involvement Program work with students in the poverty area providing special classes or serving as activity counselors.

In addition to CIP and the very highly organized tutorial program, the students at San Francisco State have a new project, launched in the spring of 1966. This is an outgrowth of the seminars they held to discuss the problem and work out means of making more effective their tutorial program and their Community Involvement Program. Specifically, this is a student sponsored seminar. They have invited a visiting professor to conduct this seminar and allocated $14,000 from the Associated Students resources "to further the establishment of an academic community by providing a structure to bring such scholars into immediate contact with the student body." The program is to be supervised by an executive committee appointed by the Associated Students to include three full-time students, two faculty members, and the visiting professor.

Students at *California State College at Los Angeles* have also introduced a proposal to finance a visiting scholar who would provide seminars for the students on campus who are participating in community projects. The result will be similar to the San Francisco State program.

An Educational Participation in Communities Project proposal has been submitted to the federal Office of Economic Opportunity for funding. The objectives of EPIC are:

1. To increase the level of aspiration and achievement of individuals from culturally deprived, minority status backgrounds by means of a continuous program of cultural enrichment.
2. To utilize the resources of faculty, students, and facilities at California State College at Los Angeles and the resources of community agencies in a cooperative community, college program.
3. To develop a direct relationship between the college student's educational desires and his community exposures.
4. To provide a model program for other colleges and universities which are similarly located in the midst of urban, culturally deprived settings.

A community involvement center is to be created on the campus of California State College at Los Angeles. The student staff would be responsible for recruiting and training approximately five hundred students to assist in various community projects. These student volunteers would generally be recruited from the total campus population; however, many would be recruited in conjunction with college courses.

The community involvement center would work closely with existing community agencies such as the public schools, Youth Opportunity Agencies, Neighborhood Youth Corps, VISTA, community hospitals, etc. The staff and students would develop tutorial programs, block clubs, recreation programs, and adult classes in homemaking, health, industrial arts, etc. These and any other programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged, which would be feasible for college students to work in from four to six hours a week, would be initiated.

Chico State College has developed a program with support from the Rosenberg Foundation and the National Defense Education Act that enables Chico State students to participate in several community involvement projects. Originally confined to the Gridley Farm Labor Camp, it now includes the Chapman School in Chico and the Burbank School in Oroville. Institute sessions are held on the Chico State College campus, and field work in the off-campus centers provides an opportunity for fifty students to obtain experience in upgrading the skills and education of those from disadvantaged areas.

Sacramento State College Farm Labor Project is one where a number of students have worked in the field with socio-economically disadvantaged farm laborers and their families. Among the projects undertaken by the students are classes for all ages, including those of junior high and high school age.

California State Polytechnic College at Pomona has a Mexican-American Student Association (MASA) which assists disadvantaged Mexican-American junior high and high school students in local schools.

San Diego State College has organized a Committee for Full Participation in the Campus Community. It is directing campus activities toward improving communication with minority groups in such areas as student activities, counseling, and instruction.

Summary. Most of these community concern projects are outgrowths of the students' involvement in attempting to recruit students from disadvantaged areas to make it possible for them to come to college and be successful. The organizing ability, the intellectual honesty, and the excitement of the students involved in these projects are bound to increase the motivation of those with whom they are working in disadvantaged areas to want to come to college. College ceases to be something aloof, apart, and foreign to the culture of the disadvantaged student and becomes a direct way of making his own life more immediately meaningful and providing for him a direct communication with society.

ON-CAMPUS STUDENT SERVICES

The task is only partially completed when disadvantaged students have been recruited to the colleges. Providing a program, services, and increasing motivation to succeed in academic pursuits must also be undertaken by the colleges. For many of these students, financial need is most often the cause of dropping out; for others, educational and vocational problems requiring special counseling is needed; and for many, help with basic skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic is most needed. These services are provided, to some extent, in all of the State Colleges.

Financial Aid. A quotation from the Admissions Officer at Fresno State College is a most appropriate description of the help the Work-Study Program has been for increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students. He said, "Twenty students on our campus this year are here because the Work-Study Program has made it financially possible. These students, we are certain, would not have been here otherwise." Typical of those State Colleges that have utilized fully the Work-Study Program, Fresno State College makes a particular point of showing how the student can pay for his college expenses and continue to be a wage earner while in college.

In the very large urban areas there are some jobs available for disadvantaged students, if not near the college, then certainly within the urban area. What the Work-Study Program has accomplished, as reported by several of the colleges, is to provide on-campus jobs so that the work itself interferes less, both in time and energy of the student, than does an off-campus job. In the case of the colleges that are not in the largest of urban areas, the Work-Study Program creates jobs where, although the work needed to be done, there simply was not any other means of helping the student finance his own program. The two major sources of federal aid, at this time, for students at the State College campuses are the Loan Program under the Higher Education Act and the Work-Study Program. Table 4 shows the extent of the Work-Study Program in the California State Colleges.

All but three of the California State Colleges have a Work-Study Program utilizing federal funds. Several of the colleges reported that they anticipate a much larger number of students participating next year under the revised eligibility rules of the Economic Opportunity Act. Several colleges reported that, with the revised eligibility requirements for Work-Study, they will be able to provide a combined "package" of financial aid—including combinations of Work-Study, loan, and grant or scholarship. The California State College system does not have a statewide scholarship or financial aid program, although a special committee is currently developing a proposal for such a program.

Counseling Services. Each of the State College campuses has a Counseling Center designed to aid students with personal and academic problems, including those who are potential drop-outs. Each of the colleges makes some attempt to follow up students who are leaving the college, but there is insufficient help in the counseling program to do this extensively in the large colleges. There are opportunities for remedial help in the basic subjects on all of the State College campuses. In some cases, this is supported directly by fees paid by the student. For instance, at California State College at Los Angeles, the Office of Special Programs offers self-support remedial courses in writing, mathematics, reading, and speech. During the fall semester, 1965, there were ninety-four students enrolled in writing, sixty-five students in mathematics, fifty students in reading, and twenty-four students in speech.

TABLE 4

Number of Students Participating in Work-Study Programs in California State Colleges, 1965–66

College	*Students Involved*
San Jose State College	550 (1)
San Francisco State College	430
Chico State College	167
California State College at Long Beach	150 (2)
California State College at Los Angeles	150
San Diego State College	120
Sacramento State College	104
San Fernando Valley State College	102
California State College at Humboldt	88
California State College at Sonoma	55
Fresno State College	55
California State Polytechnic College at Pomona	35
California State Polytechnic College at San Luis Obispo	30
California State College at Dominguez Hills	— (3)
California State College at Fullerton	25
California State College at Hayward	No program
California State College at San Bernardino	No program
California State College at Stanislaus	No program

[1] Anticipate 1500 Work-Study students by 1966–67.

[2] Forty students are working off-campus for public agencies, such as teacher aides to school districts and recreation aides.

[3] Funds available, but no students participating.

None of the State Colleges has reported a program, even informally organized, to encourage students in disadvantaged areas to go on to graduate work. On a number of campuses, however, reports indicate that individual faculty members make it a matter of personal concern to encourage able students, who might not otherwise consider graduate work, to continue immediately to graduate school.

FUTURE PROGRAMS PLANNED FOR SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Several of the State Colleges report plans to increase the number of students utilizing Work-Study, financial aid, and the tutorial programs. San Francisco State College, Fresno State College, and California State College at Los Angeles are preparing proposals to participate in the Upward Bound Program of the United States Office of Education and the Economic Opportunity Office. If these proposals are approved, the colleges would bring eleventh grade students from high schools in disadvantaged areas on to campus for an eight-week summer program and year-round counseling and follow up.

Chico State College is working out plans for counseling services and faculty assistance to be offered in the areas of speech correction, recreation, and remedial services at the Alder Springs Job Corps Conservation Center in Glenn County and the Toyon Conservation Center in Shasta County.

SUMMARY

The State Colleges vary considerably in the development of programs to increase opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged youth. Several of the colleges have reported virtually no services, projects, or programs beyond that available traditionally to all students. For example, three of the State Colleges do not now have provisions for Work-Study Programs. On the other hand, it can be seen from the foregoing survey that many of the campuses have extensive programs with effective and enthusiastic student, faculty, and administrative support. Motivation, such as that provided by the Regents' Equal Opportunity Grants to the individual campuses of the University, might stimulate additional programs in several of the State Colleges.

Among the most active programs in the State Colleges are the tutorials sponsored by the various Associated Students organizations. Much of this work was activated by the leadership efforts of the California State College Student Presidents' Association. Further support by the colleges for the efforts of this Association might help inaugurate tutorial programs in those colleges that do not have such programs now.

SECTION IV

THE JUNIOR COLLEGES

The California Junior College Association sponsored a study by Basil H. Peterson entitled *Critical Problems and Needs of California Junior Colleges*, published in June 1965. Table 7 of Peterson's report listed, in order of importance, a definition of critical problems and needs of California Junior Colleges, as analyzed from the rankings of problems and needs made by the Advisory Committee on Research and Development of the Junior College Association. Out of twenty-six problems listed, "culturally disadvantaged students" was ranked as number twenty-one. A footnote to the study indicated that this problem "is of primary interest to the Governor of California, to the California State Department of Education, and to the mayors of many cities."

Dr. Peterson described the problem of "culturally disadvantaged students" as follows:

> To define the role of the California Junior College in providing education for the culturally disadvantaged students. This specifically includes:
>
> — Determination of educational needs and problems of culturally disadvantaged students.
>
> — Devising methods and techniques for reaching effectively this group which includes many who are academically disinclined.
>
> — Building programs of instruction in general and specialized fields which are within the grasp of this group, and that will develop good citizens with some degree of occupational competence.

The Bureau of Junior College Education, of the Department of Education under the direction of the Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction, cooperated in this survey for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education by sending out the inventory to each of the seventy-six Junior Colleges in California. The form of the inventory was almost identical with that used for the reports from the University of California and the California State Colleges. Reports were returned from sixty-two of the seventy-six Junior Colleges in California.

The "open door" admissions policy of the Junior Colleges in California allows this segment of higher education to serve most extensively many of the students from disadvantaged areas. Typical of the replies from the Junior Colleges regarding admissions requirements is that from Merced College: "Our normal admissions requirements are a complete open door; therefore there is no need to make exceptions." Orange Coast College reported that 601 non-high school graduates were admitted this year. While many of the Junior Colleges have developed special admissions requirements for transfer programs, admission to all who apply is the rule for the California Junior Colleges.

RECRUITMENT OF SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Thirteen of the Junior Colleges reported specific recruitment programs for students from disadvantaged areas. In reply to the section of the inventory on recruitment, the most frequent answer from the Junior Colleges was: "Nothing is being done"; or, "Our junior college has an 'open door' policy for all students eighteen years of age or older who can profit from instruction."

Several colleges indicated, however, that although recruitment is the same for all students, they do try to work closely with the welfare office and vocational rehabilitation office or that they have given particular emphasis to working with schools in disadvantaged areas. Robert E. Swenson's reply for Cabrillo College in Aptos, California, is typical of this group. He replied, "Welfare agencies, churches, service groups, and counseling departments of high schools have been asked to refer socio-economically disadvantaged students." At Cabrillo College a special joint recruitment project with Watsonville High School has been developed.

Many of the Junior College replies indicated that their counselors visit the high schools in the spring semester, and notices are sent to firms and agencies announcing courses and admissions. A typical, general reaction from the Junior Colleges might be illustrated by the letter from Max D. Bell, Deputy Superintendent-Administration of Mount San Antonio College. He wrote,

> Here at the junior college we cooperate with unified high school districts taking the students as they become eligible for admission and doing everything we possibly can to assist them in obtaining a higher education. We have not provided 'special programs' for the socio-economically disadvantaged students, but we feel very strongly that opportunities that are available to all students at the junior college level are sufficient to meet the needs of this particular group.

The Junior College replies, so far as recruitment is concerned, fall into three categories. In the first category are those Junior Colleges which state that no special recruitment is carried on; most of these indicated that their "open door" admissions policy, regular counseling, and contact with the high schools serve the disadvantaged group as well. Fifty-one of the sixty-two Junior Colleges reporting on the inventory fall in this category.

In the second category are those Junior Colleges which have established working relationships with community agencies for particular referrals of disadvantaged students. Nine of the sixty-two Junior Colleges fall in this category. *Shasta College, College of Marin, Santa Barbara City College,* and *Contra Costa College* have established special contacts with community welfare agencies which make referrals directly to the college. Contra Costa College works with such groups as the Richmond Youth Project, the Neighborhood House, and CORE. *College of the Redwoods* reported they were greatly aided in their recruitment by the existence on campus of the State Department of Employment Office. *Vallejo Junior College, Pasadena City College,* and *Antelope Valley College* make special arrangements for publicity in community newspapers with the specific intent of recruiting students. Antelope Valley College also uses the radio station in that area. The *College of San Mateo* sends a team of counselors to the four high schools in its area which have the greatest number of disadvantaged students. They actively recruit students who ordinarily might not have come to the college. The counselors spend up to one hour with each potential College of San Mateo student from these high schools. They expect to admit between fifty and one hundred students to the college from this program in 1966.

In the third category are those four Junior Colleges reporting some special procedure to increase students' motivation to enroll. *Fresno City College* sends counselors to visit American Indian reservations and has established a special American Indian Day to aid in the recruitment of these socio-economically disadvantaged students. *San Bernardino Valley College* has developed special educational television offerings for "undecided" students. It has a federally sponsored project, "Notify," which is a series of television shows regarding job opportunities, training necessary, etc. While they are not broadcast solely for the disadvantaged, they are effective for this purpose. *East Los Angeles College* works actively with community groups to bring students from disadvantaged areas to campus for special tours. Counseling and information on financial aid are provided the students, and conferences are arranged with college personnel on enrollment. *Cabrillo College* has inaugurated Project "Open Doors" with Watsonville high school. Fifteen to twenty high potential, but "unawakened," high school juniors along with a similar number of Cabrillo students meet for one hour each week. Different faculty members meet with the students to help stimulate discussion of ideas from a variety of academic sources. Faculty members in art, English, music, drama, biology, and astronomy participate. It is hoped that the students will be motivated to enroll at Cabrillo when they finish high school.

Individual interviews with several Junior College counselors, faculty members, and administrators indicated a need for a more extensive and direct approach to the parents of disadvantaged youth while they are still in junior high or high school. However, none of the Junior Colleges reported any systematic attempt to utilize this approach as a recruitment procedure.

OFF-CAMPUS TUTORIAL PROJECTS

The off-campus tutorials are not as extensively reported in the Junior Colleges as in the University or the State Colleges. One Junior College administrator has suggested that more of the Junior College students have need to concentrate on their own college program and jobs, and that a larger proportion of the metropolitan Junior College students are from disadvantaged areas. Nevertheless, fourteen of the Junior Colleges report some participation in off-campus tutorials.

Los Angeles Harbor College reports forty students tutoring in elementary schools. *Monterey Peninsula College* students are hired as tutors by local junior high schools to work with disadvantaged children. Students at *Reedley College,* on a "personal and voluntary basis," have cooperated with the local VISTA program and are serving as tutors to elementary and high school students who reside in unincorporated communities which are socially and economically disadvantaged.

Three colleges have students serving as tutors in study centers off-campus. *College of Marin* has students at the Marin City Study Center, *Contra Costa College* has Work-Study students serving as study hall leaders and tutors in community agency centers, and *Laney College* has students serving as tutors in Oakland's Ford Foundation Centers and several church-sponsored study centers.

Students from sociology courses at *Pasadena City College* doing field work with community agencies engage in some tutorial services as a part of their field work. *Rio Hondo Junior College* has organized "Operation Classmate," which is a tutorial program organized by the college students working with disadvantaged students in three elementary school districts. Eighteen students are presently involved in this project. *Merritt College* has concentrated its efforts on schools in the areas where a relatively small number of students go on to the college. This college has students serving as tutors at both the junior high and high school level in Oakland. *Los Angeles City Col-*

lege has a Tutorial Club with "about forty" students assisting children at the elementary level.

In San Diego, both the *City College* and *San Diego Mesa College* are participating in a cooperative program with the secondary schools, financed by funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Economic Opportunity Act. This tutorial program just started in the spring semester of 1966. *Bakersfield College* has organized and supported a tutorial program at the elementary level. *Diablo Valley College* has approximately thirty-five students who are on academic probation themselves tutoring three times per week on a one-to-one basis with selected intermediate school children who have similar academic problems. The Diablo Valley College tutors are selected by the college faculty.

None of the Junior College student organizations appear to have entered into the tutorial programs with as much intensive effort and enthusiasm as the student organizations at the senior college level. It should be noted, however, that most of these Junior College attempts at offering tutorial assistance are of very recent origin, and the character and extent of such work may change drastically during the coming year.

ON-CAMPUS STUDENT SERVICES

The Junior Colleges have typically provided extensive on-campus services to aid students. While many of these services and instructional programs are not designed solely for the socio-economically disadvantaged students, such students receive the greatest proportion of benefit from these programs.

Financial Aid. The most commonly utilized financial aid in the Junior Colleges is part-time work. Fifty-two of the Junior Colleges report participation in the Work-Study Program. Table 5 shows the number of students participating in the Work-Study Program in Junior Colleges in California.

TABLE 5

Number of Students Participating in the Work-Study Program in California Junior Colleges, 1965–66

Junior College	*Students Involved*
American River Junior College	150
Antelope Valley College	30
Bakersfield College	138
Cabrillo College	59
Cerritos College	100
Chabot College	12
Chaffey College	16
Compton College	55
Contra Costa College	103
Cuesta College	9
Diablo Valley College	18
East Los Angeles College	24
Foothill College	300
Fullerton Junior College	12
Gavilan College	60
Grossmont College	65
Hartnell College	15
Imperial Valley College	6
Laney College	190
Long Beach City College	40
Los Angeles Harbor College	22
Los Angeles Pierce College	7
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College	25
Los Angeles Valley College	10
College of Marin	80
Merced College	50
Merritt College	265
Mira Costa College	23
Monterey Peninsula College	40
Napa Junior College	55
Orange Coast College	52
Pasadena City College	40
Redwoods, College of the	60
Rio Hondo Junior College	12
San Bernardino Valley College	70
San Diego Junior Colleges	220
San Francisco, City College of	1,000
San Joaquin Delta College	145
San Jose City College	19
San Mateo, College of	200
Santa Barbara City College	42
Santa Monica City College	100
Santa Rosa Junior College	5
Sequoias, College of the	55
Shasta College	100
Sierra College	35
Siskiyous, College of the	119
Taft College	8
Vallejo Junior College	70
Victor Valley College	26
West Valley College	21
Yuba College	75

Only six of the Junior Colleges report scholarship or loan funds, other than NDEA loans, available particularly for socio-economically disadvantaged students. *Imperial Valley College* reports about $14,000 available in scholarships and loans for students who have demonstrated ability and are in need. *Merced College* and *Los Angeles City College* report book loan funds, particularly for economically disadvantaged students. *Bakersfield College* has a short-term revolving loan fund which is reported to be designed particularly for socio-economically disadvantaged students. *San Jose City College* and *San Bernardino Valley College* have special scholarships for members of the Mexican-American community.

Counseling Services. The Junior Colleges place heavy emphasis on their counseling programs. Whereas most of the students in the University and the State Colleges receive all of their academic advisement from the regular teaching faculty and only a limited number of students actually utilize the counseling services, practically every student in the Junior Colleges meets with a counselor for educational advisement. The counseling programs in the Junior Colleges are a much more integral part of the instructional program of the college. For these reasons, the Junior Colleges are less likely to provide special counseling programs for disadvantaged students, even though all such students may, in fact, receive much more counseling help from the Junior College organization. Remedial services are more extensive in the Junior Colleges and are utilized by a much larger proportion of the students. In many of the larger Junior Colleges a special staff for remedial services is retained. Such persons hold positions of greater prestige on the Junior College campus than on the State College or University campus.

Several of the Junior Colleges have developed specific counseling programs to aid disadvantaged students. *Fresno City College* has one counselor assigned to work with American Indians. His responsibilities include recruitment, obtaining special financial aid, and providing educational guidance. *College of San Mateo* provides special counseling for the Adult Education Program, designed particularly to aid those who need to complete the work for a high school diploma. A large proportion of these students are adults from disadvantaged areas. *Antelope Valley College* has assigned one member of the counseling staff the responsibility of working with students who are socio-economically disadvantaged. This counselor works with 106 such students. He is also responsible for the remedial reading program. *Imperial Valley College* assigns special counseling time to all students whose grades are below average. *Contra Costa College* provides on-campus tutoring by honors students as a part of its student personnel and counseling program. *Diablo Valley College* is conducting a special NDEA (Title V) study that provides special counseling for up to three hundred enrolled Junior College students presently on probation. A large proportion of these students are socio-economically disadvantaged.

Los Angeles Pierce College has reported the steps that are typical for the counseling program in the Junior Colleges: (a) every incoming student has an appointment with a counselor to discuss guidance test scores, past scholastic record, and educational plans; (b) a reading clinic is required of all new students whose test scores indicate reading improvement is necessary; and (c) a learning center which has programmed textbooks, audio tapes, and prepared instructional materials, on a very limited basis, is available for student use for remedial work in a variety of subjects. Students are referred to the learning center by counselors and teachers.

Los Angeles Valley College and *Los Angeles Harbor College* are among those colleges that have emphasized the development of learning centers. These centers provide educational counseling for students, without appointment, for immediate help. This is help with homework for that very day or help for the student preparing for a particular examination in a particular class. About four hundred students who would qualify as disadvantaged used the Harbor College center in the spring of 1965. The director reported that a "group effect" aided in the improvement of learning for the students who use the center. Mixing older and more mature students with younger students, particularly those who had similar educational problems, contributed to this improvement. While study advice was given on a group basis to students in the center, the students would increasingly depend on one another for help with homework and other educational problems. The director also observed that girls, particularly those whose parents do not want them to go to college, are the ones who have the most difficult time. They are much more often discouraged and drop out, even though they have the ability. The counselors in the center felt that appointments with the parents were among the most profitable provisions for helping such students with educational problems.

Most of the learning laboratories and learning centers have available only a very limited number of programmed materials and new media teaching devices. The student and faculty response to those materials available has been very enthusiastic.

Basic Programs. Seventeen of the Junior Colleges report some type of "Basic," "Block," or "Level" Program. Such programs are designed for students who score on aptitude tests below the tenth to fifteenth percentile. Five of the Los Angeles Junior Colleges report such programs. The number of Junior Colleges making such provisions appears to be increasing rapidly. Typically, there are three objectives for such a program: (1) to identify at entrance students of low academic ability and achievement; (2) to remove from the regular college transfer classes students whose need for remedial instruction may slow down the progress of others in the class; and (3) to provide opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students to repair remedial deficiencies and to provide a curriculum that is of some social, educational, and vocational utility, even if the student drops out of the Junior College program early. While particular Basic Programs may differ somewhat from these purposes, they appear to be the essential objectives of most of the programs.

Several of the colleges have carried out some evaluation of these Basic Programs. *Merritt College* in Oakland and *Santa Barbara City College* have dropped most of the Program recently, while other colleges are just now inaugurating such provisions. *Compton College* prepared an extensive report of the first semester operation of its Level I Program. The students in the Level I Program at Compton were permitted to take twelve to thirteen units per semester from a limited number of classes. Students who scored below the tenth percentile on ability examinations at entrance are included in this classification. The Compton report includes a description of the characteristics of the students in the Program as follows:

> The attitude of Level I students was described as good. It was noted they are especially pleased to be able to succeed. They lack curiosity—it is difficult to stimulate discussion—and tend to just accept whatever is proposed. They are cooperative but shy at first—it is the first time in an integrated

school for some of them. While they have a short attention span, they indicate interest. They require longer to adjust to school routines than the typical college student.

Ninety per cent of the Level I students indicated that they needed to improve their English and mathematics background. There was speculation by the faculty regarding the possibility of a physical examination for Level I students under the Poverty Program which would reveal eye and teeth problems, poor diet, use of drugs, etc. The College plans to continue the program for a total of four semesters. Counselors reported that many Level I students appeared particularly uncertain, confused, and uninformed at the time of enrollment. The counselors expressed strong feelings about the necessity of offering more vocationally oriented courses for low ability students and getting more such students into programs that would help them develop vocational skills.

Instructors observed that the following classroom procedures and methods were helpful in working with disadvantaged youth:

1. Require written work at each class meeting.
2. Homework should be definite, written and required (one-half hour).
3. Plan drill and repetition . . . fewer objectives with a view of gaining mastery.
4. Change activities at least three times during a class.
5. Offer films which are on the practical level followed by discussion.
6. Give short, frequent tests which are designed to encourage study. Teacher can give a list of broad questions a week ahead, then select from these for testing.
7. Insist that students correct their tests.
8. Hold individual interviews after the first major test—if good rapport, counsel regarding unrealistic goals.
9. Begin each meeting with a review, asking for class participation.
10. Remember it is especially important to reinforce any success.

One of the difficulties with the Basic Programs appears to be faculty attitude. The Santa Barbara City College Program was abandoned by faculty vote. Several of the reports indicate that it is difficult to get faculty members who are willing to teach such classes. Los Angeles City College has carefully included faculty participation in the development of its plan for such a program. The proposal has been submitted to the Ford Foundation and would provide for systematic evaluation of the results. Most of the colleges reporting the results of Basic Programs indicate a very small proportion of students, probably less than five per cent, ever move into transfer programs later. It should be noted that most of the remedial work provided in such programs is in a class of twenty-five to thirty students. Individual tutoring and programmed remedial instruction is still not extensive. Table 6 lists the California Junior Colleges reporting some type of Basic, Block, or Level Program.

TABLE 6

California Junior Colleges Offering Basic Programs

Antelope Valley College
Bakersfield College
Cabrillo College
Compton College
Fresno City College
Long Beach City College
Los Angeles City College
Los Angeles Harbor College
Los Angeles Metropolitan College
Los Angeles Valley College
Marin, College of
Merced College
Merritt College
San Bernardino Valley College
San Diego City College
San Diego Mesa College
Santa Monica City College

SUMMARY

The Junior Colleges' program for *special* recruiting of disadvantaged students is not as well developed as those in the State Colleges or the University. Reliance on the "open door" admissions policy and the close relationships with the nearby high schools may account for this. Off-campus tutorial programs are also not as well developed in the Junior Colleges nor are community involvement projects by the students. However, the major proportion of disadvantaged students attending college in California are enrolled in the Junior Colleges. The Junior College counseling, remedial, and instructional programs are, by and large, particularly suited to aiding such students once they are enrolled in the Junior College.

Greater awareness of the need for financial assistance to students from disadvantaged areas needs to be developed. More extensive contact with parents of such students, while they are still in junior high and high school, also needs to be developed. The systematic development and funding of learning laboratories needs attention and evaluation. Nevertheless, the role of the Junior Colleges appears to be the crucial one in California provisions for increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students.

SECTION V

THE INDEPENDENT CALIFORNIA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Many of the independent colleges and universitites in California have also taken an active part in increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged youth. During the past year, particularly, a number of new programs have been instituted in the independent colleges and universities. In several of the colleges, scholarship opportunities have increased and six have exercised leadership in the development of the Upward Bound programs. All of the forty-nine independent colleges and universities which are members of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities responded to the questionnaire.

For the most part the independent colleges and universities do not make special exceptions to "normal admissions requirements." However, several of the private colleges report that their normal admissions requirements allow exceptions on the basis of judgment of the admissions officer.

RECRUITMENT OF SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Mills College has received help from high school counselors, welfare agencies, and "other key people in Oakland" in recruiting disadvantaged students to the college. In addition, Mills actively recruited candidates for its Freshman class of 1965–66 in half a dozen cities with the help of counselors in schools with a high proportion of socio-economically disadvantaged youth. Seven students ultimately enrolled at Mills in a class of 216. In 1966–67, although no special recruitment program was followed, a total of eight students out of an entering class of about 214 could be described as socio-economically disadvantaged. In both groups several students had marginal admissions credentials by Mills standards, but in only two instances in the first group and one in the second was there a significant exception to "normal" requirements with respect to College Board scores and high school records.

Occidental College has actively recruited students from among Negro and Mexican-American ethnic groups. The college reports,

> It is widely recognized that standard tests commonly in use have a significant ethnic and social bias. Accordingly the scores of students from these groups are considered on a different basis than are those from other socio-economic groups. Class standing is considered to be of greater importance than are test scores for these students. The recruitment of minority group students has been carried on both through visitation to selected high schools by admission officers and by distributing a special flyer entitled "Minority Groups Scholarship Program."

Stanford University admissions office reported that one member of the staff is assigned the responsibility of supervising minority group recruiting and visits a number of predominantly Negro or Mexican-American high schools each year. "Minority group students are in many cases admitted with lower academic requirements than would be expected from other applicants. Our freshman classes these days average between two and four per cent Negro students."

Golden Gate College has a Cooperative Education Project, sponsored by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, that has been in operation for the past year. The March 1966 report on this program indicates "recruitment must be done on a one-to-one basis." Although the project has become fairly well known throughout the community, "there is a great hesitance on the part of members of minority groups to voluntarily apply."

University of Redlands reported that most contacts for recruitment are made through high schools. About fifteen exceptions were made this year to the admissions requirements based primarily on counselor recommendations, interviews, and also high school records.

University of the Pacific has established a program in cooperation with the local junior college to seek students "who would not normally continue to a four year college or university."

The *University of San Francisco* has established a liaison with high schools in disadvantaged areas of San Francisco and recruited students by employing many of them full-time for a pre-freshman summer work study program.

Pomona College gives special consideration to minority group students and socio-economically disadvantaged youth in applying College Board test standards and other objective criteria for admission. Pomona College students established a "Committee on Human Relations" which has aided in the recruitment program.

Whittier College reported,

> Each year between six and ten students of Mexican-American or Negro descent have been recruited and admitted to Whittier College with special consideration given their College Board test scores and their academic record from high school.

At the *Univeristy of Santa Clara,* the director of admissions has been concentrating on lower income Mexican-American families in the San Jose area. The University has accepted approximately ten students for 1966–1967 on the basis of strong recommendations from the high school counselors even though the regular admissions standards were not met.

San Francisco College for Women has established preliminary contact with principals and counselors in high schools in disadvantaged areas and has made exceptions to the usual admissions standards for students from such areas and arranged for them to spread more difficult lower division required courses over a longer period of time.

Claremont Men's College normally has ten or twelve Negro or Mexican-American male students who are awarded scholarships and admitted in spite of lower College Board scores if necessary.

Many of the independent colleges and universitites reported that students from disadvantaged areas are sought as a part of the normal recruitment contacts of the institution. The total number of such students reported, however, is a small portion of the total student bodies represented. A statewide emphasis on recruitment at the junior high school level would aid the independent colleges and universities as well as the public segments of higher education.

OFF-CAMPUS TUTORIAL PROJECTS

The independent colleges and universities in the metropolitan areas have more often developed off-campus tutorial programs than those colleges more removed from large cities. Altogether eighteen of the independent colleges and universities have reported some off-campus tutorial programs.

The *University of Southern California* operates eight different tutorial projects primarily in the Watts area of Los Angeles. These involve from fifteen to fifty tutors and the same number of students working on a one-to-one relationship. During the past year about three hundred tutors were involved in the program for an average of three hours per week. The program was encouraged by the Office of the Dean of Students and coordinated by the student body.

Marymount College also organized a tutoring program in the Watts area. Approximately twelve to fifteen students spent an hour and a half per week tutoring children in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. Two children were assigned to each tutor.

Pepperdine College established a tutorial program two years ago. The tutoring is done by college seniors working with elementary school children in the southwest Los Angeles area.

The Human Relations Council at *Pomona College* has a continuing off-campus tutorial program in the East Barrio. The Pomona students have also participated in summer tutorial programs in the East Los Angeles area. Over one hundred Pomona college students have been involved in these programs.

Dominican College of San Rafael reported that student volunteers take regular assignments for study hours, recreation periods, and tutorials in schools in Marin County.

Loyola University of Los Angeles has eighty undergraduate students working in a tutorial program. This represents 5.6% of the undergraduate enrollment at Loyola.

The community service board at *Immaculate Heart College* coordinates the tutoring efforts of forty college students who help approximately one hundred fifteen elementary and secondary pupils in ten Los Angeles schools, both public and Catholic.

Pasadena College and *Claremont Men's College* also participate in off-campus tutorial programs.

Occidental College has a variety of tutoring programs for elementary and high school students. These are sponsored by student groups under the supervision of a committee in the student government structure of the college. Approximately ten per cent of the student body—almost one hundred fifty students—have been involved in these programs during the past year.

The *University of Santa Clara* initiated a program in October 1965 to provide tutors for students in the Alviso area. Thirty Santa Clara University students are active in this program.

The Student Christian Association at *La Verne College* has sponsored a tutorial program at the David and Margaret Home for children. Both elementary and high school children have benefited from this work.

Stanford University has an extensive tutorial program involving more than two hundred Stanford students in the East Palo Alto area.

University of Pacific reported that a number of its students have been active in tutorials in the South Stockton Project. This project has included work with children at the elementary and secondary levels. The Pacific Student Association and the campus YMCA and YWCA have been involved.

Students at the *University of Redlands* have a tutorial program developed under the auspices of the Christian Activities Council. "About thirty to thirty-five college students benefit in this program."

Mount St. Mary's has had a tutorial program for the past two years. Thirty students teach weekly at Roosevelt elementary school in Venice.

At *Mills College* a "core of volunteer tutors" is available for work in local public schools.[*]

Students at *San Francisco College for Women* conducted four afterschool study halls as a part of the

---

[*] In subsequent information Dean Mary Woods Bennett reported: "About 20–25 students work each year. In addition, in 1965–66 a few students carried on an activity program for 36 junior high school students in a church youth group under the direction of the College Chaplain."

Students Western Addition Project. A tutorial program as well as special after-school classes are also sponsored by students from the college in the Haight-Ashbury district. Altogether one hundred girls from the college are involved in these projects.

Pacific College reported tutorial opportunities have been organized for fifteen disadvantaged students.

Several of the independent colleges indicate that they anticipate an expansion of college student involvement in off-campus tutorial and community service projects next year.

ON-CAMPUS STUDENT SERVICES

The independent colleges and universities provide considerable on-campus aid to disadvantaged students once they are admitted. The residence programs with the resident counselors provide immediate and undifferentiated counseling for everyday problems of the student. Considerable attention is given by the independent colleges and universities to financial aid for disadvantaged students. It appears that scholarships and tuition grants are much more extensive in the independent colleges and universities than in the public segments.

Financial Aid. The forms of financial aid provided by the independent colleges and universities are concentrated in three categories: scholarships, tuition grants or grants-in-aid, and work-study programs. More than half of the independent colleges and universities have federally sponsored Work-Study Programs available this year. See Table 7. Both the number of colleges and the number of federal work study positions, however, will increase for 1966–1967. A large number of the independent colleges and universities indicate the availability of special college-sponsored work-study programs which provide services to the colleges as well as income to the students.

Several of the colleges report extensive scholarship programs. *Occidental College* has for several years invested a significant portion of its scholarship budget in students whose financial needs are very great. President Gilman reported that the recipients of this scholarship budget include representatives of all ethnic groups and are "given to students of academic promise regardless of racial origin." The Rockefeller Foundation has granted the college $275,000 to be applied, over a seven-year period beginning in 1964, to the scholarship budget. Occidental is one of seven colleges in the United States—the only one in California—to receive this sum. In the spring of 1966, Occidental received a second grant of $275,000 to continue the program for an additional three years. In addition, the college has scholarship funds for two or three "young Negro men who have begun their education at a junior college, to complete their programs at Occidental." There is also $30,000 available in the current academic year for assistance to young women from "all segments of the socio-economically disadvantaged in our society." This money is spent to assist girls in several ways. For some, it helps to finance completion of their high school careers; for others, it means scholarships for work beyond high school. The money for high school students is given by the college to high school administrators for distribution "to needy and deserving students." The students so assisted "are not selected because they are potential candidates for admission to Occidental, but simply because they are found to be worthy of assistance by the high school counselors and principals."

San Francisco College for Women has a program called Competitive Special Area Scholarships. Under this program $76,000 is committed for the academic year to provide financial aid for disadvantaged students. It is provided specifically to "enable students with a weaker general background to compete more favorably." An additional scholarship is offered "for leadership." In many instances the regular interviews and tests are supplemented with auditions and meetings in determining the recipients for these scholarships.

TABLE 7

Number of Students Participating in Work-Study Programs in the Independent California Colleges and Universities, 1965–66

College	*Students Involved*
Azusa Pacific College	140
Biola College	5
California Lutheran College	6
California Western University	8
Chapman College	35
Claremont Graduate School and University Center	15
College of Notre Dame	112
Golden Gate College	45
Harvey Mudd College	—[1]
Immaculate Heart College	100
La Sierra College	120
Loyola University	10[2]
Marymount College	30
Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies	21
Mount St. Mary's College	50
Northrop Institute of Technology	30–40
Occidental College	95
Pacific College	120
Pacific Union College	12
Pasadena College	145
Pitzer College	—[3]
Pomona College	—[4]
Saint Mary's College	18
San Francisco College for Women	250[5]
Southern California College	40
Stanford University	75
University of the Pacific	40
University of Redlands	30
University of San Diego, College for Men	50
University of San Francisco	85
University of Santa Clara	—[6]
University of Southern California	50
Westmont College	70
Whittier College	75

[1] Funds for 1966–1967.
[2] One hundred in the fall of 1966.
[3] Eighty in the fall of 1966.
[4] Funds for 1966–1967.
[5] Combines government and college work-study programs.
[6] Two hundred in 1966–1967.

President DuBridge of *California Institute of Technology* reported,

> We have always had our doors open to students of any economic level or from any part of the country provided only that they could qualify for admission. Our scholarship funds are adequate to cover needy cases, and we do have many students who can expect no help at all from their families.

Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies notes the availability of the Bing Crosby Loan Fund and the Ford Foundation Scholarship Fund among its financial aids.

University of Santa Clara has a series of university-financed scholarships ($15,000 for 1965–1966) which are assisting Negro students at Santa Clara. Ten Negro students are presently benefiting from this fund.

Saint Mary's College offers five full time tuition scholarships for disadvantaged students.

Pacific Union College reported $12,000 in scholarships given by the college each year that are designed particularly for socio-economically disadvantaged students.

Robert M. Rosenzweig, Associate Dean of the Graduate Division at *Stanford University,* reported,

> We have no financial aid program particularly for socio-economically disadvantaged students, but this is a matter of little concern, since nearly every student admitted from any background is given financial assistance if need is indicated. To the best of my knowledge, no minority student admitted to Stanford University for the past seven years has failed to receive financial aid, if financial need was shown by the College Scholarship Service.

Mills College has a program whereby a small number of students admissible as freshmen by the usual criteria, but from a "socio-economic level which would not ordinarily consider application to Mills, are given financial aid that is more generous than usual for Mills scholarship recipients."

In addition to the Upward Bound Program for 1966–67, Mills College has lifted the ceiling on aid to an individual student, "and scholarships to cover full expenses for 1966–67 have been awarded to 18 students, including the eight disadvantaged ones who could never have been encouraged to come to Mills under former regulations limiting amount of financial aid available for any one student."

Harvey Mudd College reported, "All students who meet College Scholarship Service criteria for need are provided assistance."

St. John's College also reported that it has "a policy that any deserving young man can be educated there even if he has no money."

The Board of Trustees at *San Luis Rey College* grants full scholarships to all in need.

Pomona College said,

> Although no special scholarships are set aside for the disadvantaged, generous assistance is available and most of these students will receive tuition, room and board, and required fees. Some will receive additional aid if needed.

The President of *Whittier College* reported that the college has allocated a certain portion of its budget to assist disadvantaged students by scholarships and employment.

At the *University of San Francisco,* forty-six students have been awarded Service Scholarships. These scholarships afford an opportunity for socio-economically disadvantaged students to work for part of their educational expenses. This program will be expanded to sixty students in 1966.

Many of the independent colleges indicate that in their regular scholarship program consideration of need is an important factor which allows a larger share of the funds to be awarded to disadvantaged students.

FUTURE PROGRAMS PLANNED FOR SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Independent colleges and universities have taken the lead in California in developing the Upward Bound programs. While the programs differ in detail, they fit within the framework directed by the United States Office of Economic Opportunity. The programs will begin in the summer of 1966 but include follow-up during the year.

Occidental College and *Mills College* had some initial experience with the program in the summer of 1965. Their experience and reports have aided in the development of a major nationwide program to recruit and prepare disadvantaged students for college work. At *Occidental College* in the summer of 1966, one hundred high school juniors will participate. All will come from disadvantaged families in Los Angeles County.

Marymount College will invite fifty girls to live on campus for eight weeks during the summer of 1966. The mornings will be spent in classes in linguistics, reading, literature, expression, mathematics-science, world affairs, and personality workshop. In the afternoons electives will be available in art, crafts, clothing, dance, theater arts, and physical education activities. Additional hours are to be filled with lectures, movies, discussion groups, and trips to points of interest from Santa Barbara to San Diego. These special trips will include the theater, concerts, museums and art galleries, as well as other points of recreational interest. Ten Marymount College students will act as counselors and tutors to the Upward Bound students. Scholarships will cover all expenses and include a small weekly allowance for each of the fifty girls.

The Mills College Upward Bound program is also an eight-week summer program, with follow-up activities at least twice a month during the school year. One hundred students will be included. The program will provide work in music, creative writing, dance, drama, pottery, painting and drawing, and biology, as well as discussion groups and classes in literature, natural science, and social sciences. Many of the students will be drawn from the Oakland area. All will be from families whose incomes meet the United States Office of Economic Opportunity income requirements.

Pomona College is planning the development of an Upward Bound-type program for the summer of 1967.

Stanford University also has an "Upward Bound program [which] includes academic year tutorials and medical school summer program . . ."

University of Santa Clara plans to concentrate on offering assitance to low income Negro and Mexican-American students. The University reports, however, that restricted funds "will perhaps limit us to aiding such students who reside within commuting distance of the university."

The *University of San Francisco* has established an "Urban Life Institute" which intends to serve "these youths and those in the community by strengthening resources and developing new ones."

University of Redlands is sponsoring an Upward Bound program for forty students in summer 1966. This program will be continued for eight weeks with a follow-up during the academic year 1966–1967.

Golden Gate College plans to establish a special summer session of six to eight weeks for entering freshmen with emphasis on remedial English, mathematics, and physical science. Other plans for the near future at Golden Gate include the addition of a part time person to the staff to "identify youth from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds, to counsel them regarding their college education, to encourage them if they have the ability to continue their education, and to inform them of all opportunities in higher education for socio-economically disadvantaged youths." Golden Gate College is also developing a full scale cooperative Education Program similar to that established at Antioch College. Golden Gate is continuing to receive support from the Fund for the Advancement of Education for its work in this area.

SUMMARY

It is clear from a review of this survey that a major contribution toward increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students is being made by the independent colleges and universities in California. Nevertheless, while some of the independent colleges are playing leadership roles in developing opportunities for such students, a number of the independent colleges do not report action commensurate with their potential. The significance of the leadership role of several of the independent colleges and universities can be seen, however, in the fact that six out of seven Upward Bound programs in summer 1966 are sponsored by independent colleges and universities.

SECTION VI

SELECTED OUT-OF-STATE INSTITUTIONS

Deciding which out-of-state institutions to select for this aspect of the study was not difficult. The University of Wisconsin and New York Unviersity have both taken leadership roles in the development of programs to increase opportuinites in higher education for disadvantaged youth. The State of Illinois is developing a three-segment system of higher education modeled along lines of that in California, and the Chicago City Junior Colleges and the Community Colleges in New York are among the few junior colleges outside of California that approximate the development of the California Junior Colleges. There appears to be no system of state colleges developed as yet that would be comparable to the California State College system.

The University of Wisconsin, New York University, the Loop Junior College in Chicago, and Bronx Community College in New York have been visited. Students and faculty have been interviewed in each of these institutions. The program and classes were observed, and the written material and evaluation, where available, were examined. Written information from a number of other out-of-state institutions has also been reviewed.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

The University of Wisconsin has a special Institute of Human Relations which published in 1965 a *Blue Print for Action by Universities*. Participants in the Inter-University conferences on the Negro wrote this pamphlet. Preliminary conferences were held at Wayne State University and the University of Michigan during 1963 at the invitation of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities. In February of 1964, sixty delegates from twelve universities and colleges in the midwest met to discuss the Negro in higher education. The delegates reached a consensus on several recommendations, and emphasized that providing expanding educational opportunities requires action at every level of instruction from pre-kindergarten to post-graduate training. The delegates agreed,

> The basic commitment of higher education in America must be to the fullest possible development of the talents of those individuals able to make use of higher education. Whatever blocks that development should be repugnant to the university, whether it is inadequate knowledge, poor teaching, or socio-cultural patterns different from those of the larger society.

While the focus of the conference was on the Negro, it was recognized that "innovations in education which can be anticipated with full integration of education will mean higher level of educational excellence for all, with the entire nation the beneficiary."

On the subject of needed help for prospective college students, this group recommended that colleges and universities should:

1. Make admissions requirements more flexible in order to give full opportunity to those who are not properly indentified by traditional screening instruments.
2. Review admissions requirements, generally, to achieve a student body drawn from a variety of backgrounds.
3. Support special pre-college training programs for students during the summers of their high school years.
4. Increase counseling services to high school students who have not seen college as a goal.
5. Identify bright Negro students and evolve special programs to insure their entrance into college.
6. Provide scholarships for students on a broad base and not just for those with an extremely high grade point average.
7. Provide increased orientation and counseling services to parents of prospective college students.
8. Increase the number of independent study programs of all types and encourage wider use of programmed instruction.
9. Provide adequate facilities to those who, because of their home environments, find it difficult to study.
10. Place special emphasis on the identification, recruitment, and training of students for engineering sciences, business, and government service careers while not neglecting or discouraging those who aspire to the traditional fields of teaching, social service, medicine, or liberal arts.
11. Develop college related remedial and enrichment reading programs, as well as special "how to study techniques" to increase the students' chances of attaining success in college.
12. Provide special training and programs to assist students in passing college entrance examinations and develop the art of meeting, with confidence, special scholarship examinations and interviews.

13. Engage in student exchange programs, especially with predominantly Negro colleges in the South.

In August of 1964 the University of Wisconsin published a progress report on the role of the University in equalizing opportunites for the disadvantaged. The report included a description of several major projects. The Rockefeller Foundation through Educational Services Incorporated supported one project with a $75,000 grant to conduct a Refresher Institute in Mathematics for faculty members representing forty predominantly Negro institutions in the South. The University of Wisconsin also received a $300,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation to finance a two-year faculty exchange between the University of Wisconsin and three predominantly Negro institutions—Texas Southern University, North Carolina College at Durham, and Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina.

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee initiated a program to identify bright youngsters from disadvantaged areas within the city who had not previously planned to attend college. With a foundation grant of $30,000 from the Johnson Foundation, $30,000 from the Marshall Field Foundation, $10,000 from an anonymous Milwaukee foundation, and $30,000 from the University, this experimental program identified thirty-seven youngsters. Some interesting statistics reported by the University of Wisconsin are available. Out of a Madison student body of 24,000 during the 1963–64 school year, less than 100 were Negro students—both graduate and undergraduate. At the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee a total enrollment of 10,000 included an estimated 75 Negro students—this despite the fact that there were 74,000 Negroes in the City of Milwaukee.

One-third of the initial group for this project was white; two-thirds were Negro. The students were selected near the end of their junior year in high school after a variety of tests, and with full approval of their parents. They enrolled in special summer session classes, devoted mostly to English. During their senior year in high school they received special counseling and participated in special classes to prepare them for college. Following graduation, they attended another summer session on complete scholarships and enrolled in the University in the fall.

In cooperation with the Milwaukee Public School System, a tutoring program on a student-to-student basis has been developed and study halls staffed for after school hours to provide additional study help to disadvantaged students. A pilot program for parents of socio-economically disadvantaged students has also been undertaken. The University also has a program for identification, recruitment, and extra preparation for Indian students from Wisconsin.

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has taken a leadership role in working with the Institute of Human Relations to develop many programs for adults in disadvantaged sections of Milwaukee. This program offers study in home economics, youth development, and leadership training. The University also participates in a program to organize fifty blocks in the inner core of Milwaukee with the view that the political action resulting from this would also increase the motivation of students to further education. Most of the block workers are parents with children in schools in the attendance area of one junior high school. With the help of the assistant principal and the principal of the junior high school and the cooperation of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, those children who have school problems, particularly reading problems, are identified. The block workers go to the child's home and arrange for him to get to one of three study centers. The study centers are staffed with University students and other adult volunteers. In addition to this, the mothers meet with the University Extension Service to get information on financial aid, opportunities for college, and other remedial services that are available for their children. The mothers, serving as block workers on a door-to-door, neighbor-to-neighbor basis, give this information to the parents and the children who live in their neighborhood. The object is to increase the knowledge the families of junior high students have about the possibilities for college entrance, to see that courses are taken that would enable the youngster to be able to get into college, and to provide help for improving basic academic skills.

The Inner Core project of the University conducted a survey of 300 families in the summer of 1965 to determine what the disadvantaged area families themselves thought was the most serious educational problem they faced. Interviews with a number of the block workers, supervisors, and the project directors who participated in the survey indicated two major concerns. The first problem reported consistently by the workers was the lack of reading ability. All expressed that this was a major barrier, a distinct handicap, in the view of these families. Second, the families had no information about the possibilities for financial support for the student to enter college. In many instances, when asked about the possibility of more education for their children, they said that they would like it, but they didn't see how they could support it financially.

The assistant principal of the junior high school directed the school aspects of the program. He asked for a special remedial program for sixty of the youngsters for the summer of 1965; this was organized with help from the University. He reported, however, that the percentage of junior high students that increased their reading ability substantially as a result of the program was very low, even though there was a full-time professional teacher and two aids for each of the classes which met for a six-week period, five days a week. Other benefits accrued from the program, particularly in the realm of motivation for the student. Nevertheless, the director felt that remedial efforts at the junior high level have a very low percentage of return.

This Community Action Program in Milwaukee has also established centers for creative arts experiences in three of the neighborhood churches. The creative arts classes proved to be very popular with students. The volunteer teachers report that members of some tough gangs attended regularly and participated successfully. The accepting atmosphere of the creative arts teaching made it possible for some of the volunteers, who generally were not from minority groups, to establish communication with the sixty-five to ninety students—particularly with the older ones—who were coming to the center. These same volunteers supported an additional program in reading and set up special Saturday reading tutorials for such students, because of the large proportion of students who expressed a need for reading help.

The efforts of the University of Wisconsin to improve opportunities for disadvantaged students are comprehensive and vital. At this point, it appears that the barrier to further success includes the problem of overcoming the language arts deficiencies of disadvantaged students.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Another university with an extensive program for work with the disadvantaged is New York University; it has a comprehensive public service program. One of the most ambitious projects is entitled APEX, a program for excellence in urban teacher education. Sixty Negro, Puerto Rican, and lower-class white high school graduates from the slums of New York City who have just graduated from a general curriculum with no hope of professional careers, according to the directors of this program, were brought to New York University in a radical departure in teacher education. They are to be paired, housed, and trained with sixty "Peace Corps types" to become teachers.

The students were selected in the spring from two high schools in disadvantaged areas of New York. After a special training summer program on campus and at New York University Camp, fifty-nine out of the original sixty students enrolled at New York University in the fall of 1965. During the fall semester the students had two credit courses and three non-credit courses. The group of fifty-nine students was divided into three groups—a high, middle, and low achievement group. The level of work required was adjusted to the achievement level of the students. All of the students were brought on campus and housed at one of the campus hotels. All of the students have a Work-Study position and receive room, board, and a tuition scholarship for five years.

With the help of the pre-college program, the students in this Project APEX will be able to complete four years of academic work in five years, successfully meeting the normal requirements for graduation. The Office of Economic Opportunity has contributed $300,000 toward this project. This is one of twelve pilot "Upward Bound" programs supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity this year.

Several observations can be made of this program at this point. First, the students themselves are enthusiastic about the program. Over half of them do not consider themselves culturally deprived. Most of them feel they would have made it to college one way or another, though with greater difficulty, whether they were included in APEX or not. They do agree, however, that the complete financial aid package that is included with the project and the prestige of acutally moving to the University has helped them. In many cases, their parents have provided some additional support or moved the family residence in order to help the student when he returns home on weekends. Several students gave illustrations to show that they were college-bound material, even apart from the project. One talked about the cultural background, including music and plays provided for him by his father. Another commented on the reading material he received from his mother. Still another reported that he and his parents have always planned for him to be a minister.

The students' academic success during the fall semester was mixed. Most of them agreed that they needed to spend more time studying. Some rules were changed with the help of the residence assistants. These are graduate students serving as residence assistants for each six or seven APEX students. The resulting change in rules required that the students must be in their rooms studying from 8–10 p.m. week nights. The students resented this restriction. They felt it really takes more time than two hours to study, and they needed even more time with the graduate assistants available to help them with tutoring.

Nevertheless, the APEX students are enthusiastic about their experiences, and many of them mentioned that their sights have been raised. They believe the possibilities of success in college are greatly enhanced by this program, and the staff members are also very hopeful about the project. A good deal of flexibility in changing the rules is exhibited as the staff gets more experience with the program. Four courses are being taught in this program solely for these students—writing, speech, social sciences, and biological sciences. These courses are intended to help bring the APEX students up to a beginning college level. During the next two years they will take a gradually increasing proportion of regular classes, so that by the time they are juniors, they will be taking a full load of University credit courses. Their fourth and fifth years will be academically the same as all other New York University teacher education students.

Each APEX student is provided special medical-dental help, educational counseling, and psychiatric help, as needed, at the expense of the program. Judging from the planning, financial support, staff, and students' attitudes, at this time, the project should be very successful. An observation in a special English class in which the students had prepared some of their own poetry was very encouraging. This was the upper ability group of the fifty-nine APEX students; their performance was certainly equivalent to many English classes at the freshman level. Much of the credit for this achievement was obviously due to the superior teaching ability of the professor, but the background of the students, the special tutoring, and the feeling of confidence the students had built up also contributed to the excellent writing produced.

There are other programs less inclusive than this one, supported by Upward Bound as pilot projects throughout the country. Institutions that are involved at this time include Western Washington State College and a group of colleges serviced through Educational Services Incorporated—Howard University, Dillard University, Fisk University, Texas Southern University, Webster College, and Morehouse College. The other colleges in the pilot programs were: the University of Oregon, Independent Talent Search Colleges in the Northeast, Ripon College, Columbia University, New Mexico Highlands, Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State College, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, and College of the Ozarks. No California college or university was included in this program.

Seton Hall University, in Newark, New Jersey, ran a six-week pre-college Head Start Program for 105 students from economically disadvantaged sections of the city. The program offered remedial reading, English expression, mathematics, music appreciation, sculpture classes, trips to New York theaters, and similar activities. The University plans to expand the program in the summer of 1966. No follow-up has yet been made of the students who entered college.

The University of Pennsylvania and Lincoln University in Pennsylvania carried on a similar project. The University of Pennsylvania set up a Counselor Institute to help guidance workers to work with students from low income backgrounds. They concentrated on vocational guidance, college entrance requirements, and financial aid information. The plan is to have the students who are now in the program attempt to complete their four-year college program in five years, taking twelve semester credits of regular courses and six credits of remedial work as they progress.

During these pilot stages of the Upward Bound program, 2,061 secondary school students participated this past year. Of these first Upward Bound students, 1516 are now enrolled as college freshmen or special students, combining college and remedial work. At this point, however, the results of Upward Bound have not been systematically evaluated. A contract with the Institute for Services for Education in Washington calls for evaluation and publication of the results.

BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Another program in the New York area is centered at Bronx Community College; the project is entitled "College Discovery Program." This program was initiated during the summer of 1964 as a part of an experimental five-year program supported by funds from the New York State Legislature for the use of the City University of New York and two Community Colleges—Bronx and Queensborough. This College Discovery Program provides for a maximum of 250 high school graduates of the 1964 class, equally divided between the two community colleges. The students are recommended by the high school counselors to the City University Advisory Committee for final selection. Criteria includes evidence of strong motivation, qualities of leadership, and creative ability. Their scholastic averages would not have permitted them to gain admission to the college, if it were not for this program. Research for the program is being conducted by the Social Dynamics Research Institute of the City University under the direction of Dr. Kenneth B. Clark. The aim of the program is to provide college opportunity for students who might otherwise be unable to attend college. Special provisions of the program are as follows:

1. Students are considered special matriculants in liberal arts or other transfer curriculum leading to a baccalaureate program.
2. The program is tuition free.
3. Every attempt is made to protect the anonymity of the students.
4. Students are required to attend the 1964 summer session.
5. Students are required to follow the same regulations and standards as other students in the college.
6. Students attend school full time during the day.

Before admission to the six-week summer session at Bronx Community College, students were required to take freshman placement examinations in modern languages, English, mathematics, and science knowledge tests. Two orientation sessions were held before the summer session began. Each of the 120 students who registered were required to take two courses; the assignment was based on the student's particular needs, as shown by the placement examination. Most of the students were assigned to reading improvement and mathematics courses, but a few took regular courses in the liberal arts curriculum. Each of the students was also provided special counseling service, a student center with a tutor available, and special individual and group testing from the Social Dynamics Research Institute.

Of the 120 students registered, 118 completed the 1964 summer program. One hundred twelve registered for the fall 1964 semester, and 104 registered for the spring 1965 semester. Ninety-eight students completed the spring semester. Thus, for the first year there were twenty-two students (18%) who withdrew from the program for reasons of their own. Reasons given for withdrawal are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8
Bronx Community College "College Discovery Program"
Reasons for Withdrawal of Twenty-Two Students

Reasons	*Male*	*Female*
Transfer to another college	–	1
Work	5	2
Health	–	4
Psychiatric treatment	1	1
Incapable of college work	–	1
Armed Services	4	–
C. D. P. Stigma	1	–
Not ascertained	2	–

By November it was found that forty-eight out of the ninety-four students who participated in a survey had such basic needs as clothing, dental care, car fare, lunches, eyeglasses, and pocket money. Of the ninety-four students, twenty-one are employed outside of the college working from twelve to thirty hours per week, and fourteen of these stated that they must contribute to family expenses from these earnings. The same survey showed that only a few of the students participated in student activities and campus functions. Family backgrounds indicate that in one-third of the homes a foreign language is spoken.

During the summer of 1965 a second group was started. The school set up a special program for parents. The parents were invited with letters written in English and in Spanish. Two different Sundays were set during the summer session, so that the parents could attend. Parents who did not attend the first meeting were sent a second card and letter saying that the school was very sorry that they had missed the first meeting and urging them to attend the second one. The students were encouraged to bring their parents along to these meetings. In the meeting the purpose of the program, the possibility for financial aid, and the kind of program the student would be taking was explained, both in English and in Spanish. Those who participate in the program feel that this additional attention to parents has strengthened the program considerably.

On observation, the program was extremely well organized—one of the best from this standpoint. One recommendation from the director at the end of the first year was that loans be advised for more students, which would permit them to limit their outside employment responsibilities. The director also recommended that students with a grade point index below 2.0 be encouraged to attend summer school and that the tutoring program begin earlier in each semester. The total cost of this program is considerably less than that of similar programs elsewhere, because much of the expense was borne by the regular budget of Community College.

Observations were also made at Herin High School, which is one of the high schools included in the College Discovery Program. The counselor responsible for the program indicated that the achievement requirements for the program are such that the students with reading difficulties still recognize this as their major barrier. He found it particularly difficult to recruit those students whose parents themselves were not aware of such a program and of the increased employment opportunities that would result from such additional education for their children.

The State of New York publishes a brochure entitled, "New York State Help for Your College Education." It combines information on the State University Program, the Community College Program, and the Regent's College Scholarship Program. The loan provisions of local banking institutions is also presented. A number of students indicated that their first knowledge of the financial feasibility of being able to attend college came to them as a result of a counselor giving them a copy of this brochure. Several stated that none of their neighbors and no one in their family had ever attended college, and none of them had any realistic information on what happened in college or what it would cost. The counselor at Herin High School indicated that even with recent improvements, the student-teacher load leaves little time for college counseling, particularly of students who are borderline.

THE LOOP JUNIOR COLLEGE

Another system making provisions for disadvantaged students is the City Colleges of Chicago. Two of these colleges, Wright Junior College and The Loop Junior College, provide an interesting contrast. Wright Junior College is in a middle or an upper-middle class area of the city and reports more financial aid available than students willing to take advantage of it. On the other hand, The Loop Junior College is in the heart of Chicago's Loop District and is trying to increase the percentage of success for many disadvantaged students who attend this college.

The Loop Junior College has placed a good deal of emphasis on its Basic Program. It is similar in many respects to the programs in several of the California Junior Colleges designed for students who score in the lower ten per cent of entering freshmen. The objectives of this program, according to the junior college, are: (1) to give students, who from all available evidence are deemed incapable of college level work, a program of instruction geared to the development of whatever potential they have; (2) to preserve the standards of the regular college level course by excluding from them students who, on all available evidence, were foredoomed to failure because of lack of ability or insufficient preparation; (3) to identify those students with enough potential to qualify eventually for regular college programs but who, on account of psychological problems or other kinds of problems, were misappraised by ACT, and to prepare such students psychologically for regular college work; and (4) to help students identify these academic and vocational areas of interest in which they have reasonable expectation of success.

The Basic Program started with a group of thirty-three students in 1964. All of the students had a composite percentile between 1 and 6 on the ACT. By the end of the first trimester, twenty-eight students remained. All of them had the following program: English *Communication Skills,* five hours; Social Sciences *Man and His Culture,* three hours; Humanities. *The Living Arts,* three hours; and Psychology *Personal and Social Adjustment,* three hours. The courses are not intended to be preparatory for regular college courses but are meant to offer "training and experience conducive to the development and training of each individual student according to his level of ability." The courses were taught by regular full-time faculty members. A special program of group and individual counseling was provided for each of the students. A series of tests, including mechanical reasoning, clerical speed, and accuracy, were used to aid in vocational counseling. The program is planned for two consecutive terms.

The retention rate of this program was considerably higher than for students with similar ability prior to the adoption of the program. In the words of the staff, however, the Basic Program must be evaluated eventually in terms of success or failure of an individual student to achieve a level of adjustment, either in additional academic work or in seeking and obtaining employment and engaging in generally self-rewarding activities. The second year of the program, 1965–66, remains approximately the same, except that the program will be expanded to schedule seventy students in two groups of thirty-five each.

The ACT percentile cutoff has now been raised to the tenth percentile. The students are block programmed to take English, Social Science, Humanities, and an elective course, followed by the Psychology of Social and Personal Adjustment. The courses do not carry transfer credit, and they are not intended to be remedial. A major emphasis of the program is to direct the students to appropriate employment. The counselors for the program work for employment offices of the state and with the Civil Service Commission. Both agencies help direct the students toward specific jobs as they complete their college programs.

The students at The Loop Junior College sponsor two additional programs. One is called Operation Forty. Students on the dean's honor list and members of Phi Theta Kappa, the honorary scholarship association, provide regular seminars in the transfer course subjects—Biology, Humanities, English, Physical Science, and Social Science. This program is not based on tutoring, but on small group advice. The review and help with homework follows along with the outline of the courses taught by the instructors. The major device is a group discussion of the particular day's or week's lecture by all of those who are involved in the program under the leadership of the honor student.

The second student-sponsored program is an off-campus tutoring project. This is designed to help disadvantaged students at the junior high and high school level to take the proper courses while they are in high school and help them with their homework, so that they are more likely to be prepared to enter college.

An important contribution of The Loop Junior College program is the report of results so far. Of students in the Basic Program, only six to seven per cent actually succeed in a remedial program that would allow them to get into the transfer courses, and less than one percent of the original group take and succeed in the transfer courses. The counselors, teachers, and administrators involved in the program all feel that the lack of reading and writing skill is the major hindrance to the success of the students, and most agree that the proportion helped by the remedial aspect of the program is a very small percentage, probably in the neighborhood of one per cent of those enrolled in such programs.

SECTION VII

FEDERAL, STATE AND FOUNDATION FINANCIAL AID*

A number of federal agencies and some California State organizations offer support to higher education to increase opportunities for disadvantaged students. Some private foundations have also demonstrated an interest in this problem. Among the most prominent foundations supporting such programs in higher education are the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

CARNEGIE CORPORATION

The Carnegie Corporation in its annual report for 1965 stated in the section on Improvement of Educational Opportunities,

> Efforts being made by many colleges to recruit disadvantaged students will be of no avail unless the student can make the grade. One of the most important reasons for the high college drop out rate among this group of students is their inadequate preparation in the basic subjects, English and Mathematics.[1]

The Carnegie Corporation supported Educational Services Incorporated, which prepared materials in English and mathematics for use in such prefreshman courses. This Corporation also supported programs involving approximately 1200 high school seniors in special Saturday classes and an intensive eight-week summer institute. This approach is now supported by the United States Office of Education as Project Upward Bound. The Carnegie Corporation has also supported the program at Brandeis University that is very similar to Upward Bound. This project provided an eight-week summer session for an integrated group of about thirty students who have been accepted for fall, 1965, entrance at Brandeis, and other institutions in the Boston area, Harvard, Tufts, and Boston. The curriculum at these sessions did not stress any particular subject for the student but attempted to develop his self confidence, ability to read, to analyze carefully, and to communicate effectively.

The Corporation has also supported counseling and encouragement of disadvantaged students under a grant to the Friends Neighborhood Guild of Philadelphia. Under an intensive three year program funded by Carnegie and the Rockefeller Foundations, the Guild will counsel students who are not otherwise likely to continue their education. The counseling will include the parents and will center on educational opportunities available and preparation needed. It will arrange tutoring and supplementary education as needed and help the students apply for admission to college and for financial assistance. One important aspect of this program will be the training of counselors in public high schools for the program.

FORD FOUNDATION

The Ford Foundation in a booklet published July 14, 1965, entitled "Foundations, Schools, and the Public Good" by Edward J. Meade Jr., reported that the Foundation has supported a number of programs for disadvantaged youth. Most recently the grants have been awarded in urban areas, such as Nashville, Tennessee; Durham, North Carolina; Atlanta, Georgia; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Oakland, California. The Ford Foundation is attempting to develop an alternative to the "crisis approach of Federal legislation and grants." The report stated,

> If one were to accept the crisis philosphy, funds would be spent primarily to apply existing knowledge and educational technology to problems across the board in all grades and for all youngsters. Such an approach would result in remedial and compensatory education programs. No doubt, it would be an improvement but it would certainly not be a solution. Patching up failure does not eliminate the causes of failure. The school systems in these cities aim at doing something fundamental about the problems of the education of disadvantaged children.[2]
>
> The Ford grants to these cities are directed to *develop cooperative arrangements among the educational resources of the community which include urban universities and colleges and the school systems.* . . . Unfortunately, educational institutions in most communities have not developed a system of marshalling and applying their resources to solve emerging problems effectively and continuously. (Emphasis added.)

The second objective of these programs is "In each of these cities, attempts are being made to use new cooperative arrangements to reform the beginning years of school, not merely for the disadvantaged but for all."

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

The Rockefeller Foundation published a special report in the Spring of 1965 entitled *The Long Road to College: A Summer of Opportunity.* The report describes the programs for disadvantaged students sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation in the summer of 1964 on the campuses of Dartmouth, Oberlin, and Princeton. The Foundation provided $450,000 a year for a period of three years, starting with the summer of 1964. The money was divided equally among the three institutions. A total of 152 students per year participate in the program.

---

* See appendix for references.

The project varied from school to school. The students at Princeton were required to take a science course, a literature course, and a sculpture course. At Dartmouth the students were given intensive work in English and mathematics. Their program began at 6:50 a.m. and ended at 10:00 p.m. With the exception of meals, there was only one free hour. Two hours a day were devoted to English, two hours to mathematics, and two hours to athletics. At Oberlin students were required to take either mathematics or English and to elect either biology or social studies. More time was devoted at Oberlin to individual projects in art, music, or physical education. A wide range of field trips, special lectures, and performances were provided. All three colleges included students who were not Negroes; all three selected students from high schools with help from the high school faculties.

The Foundation report stated,

> Helping to achieve equality of opportunity is one of the Rockefeller Foundation's *five major interests* . . . the summer programs are one important part of the Foundation's total effort toward equal opportunities. During the past two years it has appropriated just about nine million dollars for twenty-nine institutions similarly interested in enlarging educational opportunities for Negro and other disadvantaged students. (Emphasis added.)[3]

FEDERAL AID

Of course, the largest source of funds for public support of institutions is the federal government. A large number of different acts, grants, and programs are now available to support college programs designed to improve educational opportunities for disadvantaged children. During the past few months, a number of guides have been published to the various federal programs. Most recent is a publication called "Education, an Answer to Poverty: School Programs Which May Be Eligible for Federal Aid." This booklet, published jointly by the United States Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity, gives some relevant examples of the kinds of programs that are supported under several of the acts. For example, under Special College Orientation Programs, the agencies state,

> In coping with the problems of disadvantaged students, most of an educator's effort is directed toward preparing a maximum number of students for employment after leaving high school. This effort may obscure the national urgency for identifying every undermotivated and every underachieving student who through especially intensive and dedicated attention may be lifted to college eligibility. No greater service can be performed for the disadvantaged student than equipping him for a college career he might not otherwise have.[4]

Support is described for a program that provides for summer sessions, special Saturday classes, and follow-up to increase not only the likelihood that students from disadvantaged areas would enter college but that they would be successful when they get there. Such projects can be supported by the Community Action Program funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. They may also be supported under Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Acts, 1965. In addition, the Office of Economic Opportunity has a special program called Upward Bound, which will select 200 colleges to provide summer on-campus programs for about 25,000 eleventh grade high school students and year round follow ups. The objective is to increase motivation, skills and cultural background to encourage disadvantaged students to enter higher education.

The booklet states that some of the programs available to students after they enter a college, particularly a junior college, can be supported by the Vocational Educational Act of 1963. Some examples of this include the physical science technician.

> Students completing three years of this program are equipped for routine technical jobs or for enrollment in a technical college. Another is a graphic duplication specialist. A beginners job for operators of small lithograph offset presses, machines, hectograph, stencil duplicators, electrostatic duplicators, paper cutters, punchers, folding machines and binders. Another is a two year, two hour a day course which instructs students in normal, physical, mental, and emotional behavior patterns of preschool children and attempts to prepare them to work in day-care centers, nurseries, hospitals, children's institutions and private homes.

Programs of this type may be supported under both the Vocational Educational Act of 1963 and funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I and Title III. Similar training programs for disadvantaged school youth may also be supported under the Manpower Development Training Act.

Another recent publication of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education entitled "First Work of These Times: A Report to the People on Education" included a section devoted to aid to colleges and college students. The department reports that with today's average family income of $6,000 a year, millions of young people cannot afford to go to college. The relationship between family income and college attendance is clear. "In 1960, 78% of high school graduates whose family incomes were at least $12,000 attended college while only 33% of students whose families earn $3,000 or less went on to higher education." (page 26) Thus the Student Loan Program is a key provision of the National Defense Education and Higher Education Acts.

The Higher Education Act permits graduate students to borrow up to $1,500 a year and the National Defense Education Act allows undergraduates up to $1,000 a year. The report indicates that by June, 1966, approximately 890,000 students at 1,700 institutions will have borrowed almost $800 million to finance their college education. But since fall, 1963, more than 100,000 student borrowers have applied for partial cancellation of their loans because they have become teachers. Starting in September, 1965, about 530,000 students will borrow approximately $400 million for an average loan of $750 under the new guaranteed student loan program.

Finally, the College Work-Study Program is available. It also is an effort to halt the "drain of talent and promise" described by President Johnson. He indicated that 100,000 high school graduates, academically qualified to enter college, failed to do so for lack of money. The Work-Study Program provides jobs for needy students to help them finance their college education. They may work up to fifteen hours a week and full time during the summer if they have no classes. The definition of need is to be determined by the college.

Some examination of Title II of the Social Security Act should be made. The new provisions in this act make it possible for 295,000 students ages 18–22 to be eligible for financial assistance. The revised act eliminates a former age 18 cut-off date for benefits for some 2.6 million children under 18 who are now receiving assistance. Basically, the revised act extends to age 21 the period of eligibility for educational benefits for full-time unmarried students attending any public or accredited private school, college or university.

A very brief summary of the recent federal legislation should be helpful. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has five titles. The first provides for payment to school districts of one-half of the average of the per-pupil expenses for children from families of an income below $2,000 per year under certain conditions. Title II authorizes the distribution of $100 million to the states for the acquisition of library resources, including textbooks and audiovisual materials. Title III provides $100 million for grants to local school districts for the establishment of supplementary education centers. Title IV makes another $100 million available over the next five years for regional education research training facilities. Title V appropriates $25 million to strengthen state departments of education.

The National Defense Education Act has eight active titles. Title I merely furnishes a guide to general provisions of the act. Title II authorizes approximately $180 million for the next year for loan programs to assist college students. Title III authorizes $90 million annually for federal and state matching programs for which local school districts may purchase equipment, materials and strengthen instruction. Title IV provides for graduate fellowships to help colleges meet the need for increasing numbers of teachers. Title V appropriates nearly $25 million for matching grants to the states for support of guidance and counseling programs including training institutes. Title VII authorizes direct grants-in-aid to local school districts for experimentation and development of education media. Title VIII has been replaced by the Vocational Educational Act of 1963. Title IX authorizes the National Science Foundation to provide for general science information services. Title X provides grants for state education agencies to provide statistical services and Title XI provides $32 million annually for grants to support the operation of teacher-training institutes open to elementary and secondary school teachers.

Another act, the Vocational Educational Act, authorizes appropriations of $177.5 million during the fiscal year and $225 million annually starting July 1, 1966. Nineteen per cent of the total appropriations of reserves are set aside for demonstration grants.

The Economic Opportunity Act includes authorization to increase opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students. The college Work-Study Program has been one of these. While the administration of the program has now been turned over to the United States Office of Education, its authorization is under the Office of Economic Opportunity. The Congressional presentation for funds in April, 1965, stated the Work-Study Program provides part-time employment of college and university students from low income families. On campus, jobs include dormitory and plant maintenance, food service, clerical work, library indexing, laboratory assistance and similar tasks. Off-campus employment is provided by agreements with public or private non-profit organizations which place students as tutors, youth workers, recreation leaders, community service aids, etc

The authorization this year provided for a new division of student financial aid in the Office of Education to provide for a coordinated administration of the college Work-Study Program and the Student Loan program. This is part of the intent of providing Financial Aid packaging. Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is designed to remove the economic barriers that could stand in the way of students getting into college. The combination of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Higher Education Act, and the National Student Defense Loans increases the possibility of financial packaging.

It is possible to provide up to fifty per cent of the student's financial package out of educational opportunity grants under Title IV of the Higher Education Act. The student may also secure financing through college Work-Study Programs and through the National Defense Student Loan Program. State and private non-profit organizations may also provide loans reinsured by the federal government. Very low interest rates, deferment of payment of interest, and even forgiveness of the loan in some circumstances, have been provided. Again the definition of need is now much more flexible, and the college makes the determination.

Kingston Johns, financial aid officer at North Carolina State University, wrote in a recent article:

> Because of limited staffs and inability to predict academic success for youngsters from deprived backgrounds, few colleges are now able to do an adequate job of recruiting candidates for college Work-Study programs. The focus is currently on secondary school counselors who must be responsible for the early identification of the development and encouragement of latent talent. It is hoped that many of those students who show real promise will be admitted to college with sufficient funds approved in each case to meet most of their expenses, once the schools and colleges mutually agree on the details of a cooperative venture. . . . But there is a definitive need for an administrative pattern in which a state or a relatively cohesive area in a state would accomplish the identification, the encouragement, the early aid guarantee, the admissions, and the college counseling.[5]

A model is needed that could be used by states to produce large numbers of potentially eligible students, otherwise "no matter how well intentioned the activities of state and local governments, secondary schools, social agencies, and institutions of higher education, could all be at cross purposes and the objectives of higher education act could be largely unfulfilled."

In order to increase the effectiveness of federal funds, the United States Office of Education plans to notify colleges by March 15, 1966, of the allocations for the 1966–1967 academic year. This will make it possible then, to blend aid under Educational Opportunity Grants, National Defense Education Act loans, reinsured loans, and the Work-Study Programs in time to encourage the student to attend with some financial assurance at the time that he applies to the college.

It is easy to see why high school counselors have difficulty in making the provisions for financial aid clear to the student and his parents. Some quotations from a publication by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, entitled "Higher Education Act of 1965" section by section analysis will illustrate this point. Under Title IV, student assistance, starting on page 13:

> An institution which awards an educational opportunity grant to a student under this part will, for the duration of the grant, pay to the student for each academic year during which he is in need of grant aid to pursue his course of study, an amount (not in excess of the lesser of $800 or one-half of the sum of the amount of student financial aid, excluding assistance from Work-Study programs, provided by the institution or by a state or private scholarship program, or not in excess of $200 more than such amount if the student concerned was during the preceding academic year in the upper half of his college class) to be determined by the institution.

Another quotation, from page 19:

> The payment a student is entitled to have made on his behalf under this section will, during the period which precedes the repayment period of the loan, be equal to the total amount of the interest which accrues prior to the beginning of the repayment period, and will, during the repayment period, be equal to 3 per cent per annum of the unpaid principal amount of the loan. However, the payment may not exceed, for any period the amount of the interest, which (but for such payments) would be actually payable by the student, taking into consideration interest payments on his behalf for that period under any state or private loan insurance program.

These two quotations are not unique; they are typical of much of the language in the documents. Clearly some direct simple explanation of the types and availability of financial aid to disadvantaged students is needed.

UPWARD BOUND

The Upward Bound programs have been expanded through support of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the United States Office of Education. The Upward Bound programs are administered and evaluated through a private agency, Educational Services, Inc. Under the Upward Bound Program, up to two hundred students may be brought on to campus for a nine-week summer session. These eleventh graders from high schools in the economically disadvantaged areas are selected cooperatively by the college, and the high school administrators, counselors, and teachers. All of the Upward Bound programs must now provide some year-round follow-up of the students. Typically, the program includes basic remedial work in language skills, and a heavy emphasis on cultural enrichment, introduction to social issues and the college environment with a view toward motivating the student for higher education. The independent colleges, the University of California, and the State Colleges in California are participating in these programs. Federal support has made it possible to include extensive medical, psychological, and sociological consulting for these students as well.

The resources to eliminate the financial aid barrier to higher education are at hand. If methods to inform the disadvantaged students and their parents of the availability of such funds and to help them to obtain such funds are devised, an increase in opportunity for higher education for the disadvantaged will be achieved.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS*

California has made progress toward increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged youth. Even during this past year, many new programs were initiated in the segments of public higher education, and most existing provisions for disadvantaged youth were expanded. All segments appear to have made progress, acting for the most part independently, but cooperating with other institutions and agencies as the need arose. Nevertheless, more can be done.

The barriers to increasing opportunity are financial, geographic, motivational, and academic. Some of the barriers have already been greatly lowered; attempts have been made to reduce all. More progress can be made if some additional provisions are attempted. The spirit of responsible individual action and the dedication of groups of students and faculty on many campuses have provided much of the impetus for active concern shown by the colleges and universities to solve this problem. This enthusiasm is the most effective ingredient in this important campaign. The energies of these students and faculty have not been, and must not be, dissipated in complicated organization, administrative "red tape," or multiple hierarchies of coordination, supervision, and review.

Statewide administrations for the State Colleges and the University of California have wisely taken the role of support for much independent action on the part of the various individual colleges and campuses. This approach has encouraged more experimentation, individual responsibility, and rapid program development during this past year. For the most part, the same administrative approach should be continued. However, with the expansion of the many programs, additional administrative assistance will be needed, and the assignment of coordination responsibility, such as that already provided in the University system, may be needed for the other segments.

FINANCIAL BARRIERS TO INCREASED OPPORTUNITY

Some of the financial barriers to higher education have been eliminated, or very greatly lowered, during the past two years. All three segments of public higher education in California have played leadership roles nationally in maintaining tuition-free opportunities for all California youth. Nevertheless, the financial burden of obtaining a higher education has been increasing for the students. Transportation costs, living costs, including board and room, and clothing costs have continued to rise. The proportionate increase in financial burden, therefore, has been much larger for students from families with limited income. Such families and such students spend a much larger proportion of their total income on these rising costs of higher education.

The State Scholarship Program, the Regents' Opportunity Scholarships, the Work-Study Program, National Defense Education Act loans, government insured loans, and Opportunity Grants all contribute to the lowering of financial barriers to higher education in California. However, more widespread utilization of these opportunities can be made. Apparently many families in disadvantaged areas are still not aware of the nature and extent of financial aid for higher education that is available. Thus, the impact of such programs in lowering financial barriers has not been as great as it should be.

The variety of sources of financial aid is large. Financial aid packages—scholarship, loan, and Work-Study—can appear complicated and formidable to families completely unfamiliar with colleges, college costs, and admissions requirements. While the student from more advantaged areas can rely upon his own family for help in writing to colleges, obtaining information, using appropriate library resources, and even visiting campuses to meet with admissions officers and counselors, the student from the disadvantaged area is much less likely to get such help from his family. This is a distinct handicap, even for the student who has the academic ability to succeed in college, but it is an even greater handicap for the student who is borderline in apparent ability.

A related handicap to utilization of the available financial aid is the extent of information provided students in disadvantaged areas from their high schools. Students from disadvantaged areas are handicapped by less likelihood of receiving early and complete advisement toward college from high school counselors. Counselors in disadvantaged areas spend a much smaller proportion of their time providing educational counselling for members of the student body preparing for college. They get fewer inquiries about college financial assistance, admissions requirements, and instructional programs than do counselors in more advantaged areas where a larger proportion of the student body attends college. Even more influential than this, however, is the fact that parents of students in disadvantaged areas are much less likely to contact the high school counselor to request information about colleges than is true in the advantaged areas. For all of these reasons, the high school counselors in disadvantaged areas have much less time to become familiar with college financial aid information and to present it effectively to as many students as do counselors in advantaged areas.

---

* Recommendations which follow are those of the author. For actions taken by the Council see "Recommendations Based on the Report" included at the close of this report.

It is recommended that the segments of higher education cooperate, on a regional basis, to provide financial aid information and admissions information to counselors, students, and parents in high schools and junior high schools in disadvantaged areas. It is recommended, therefore, that a statewide brochure be published that provides financial aid information in an easily understood form. Such a brochure should be directed toward the disadvantaged student and his family. It should combine the information from the segments of higher education in California and should be prepared annually. It should describe financial aid "packages"—Work-Study Programs, grants, scholarships, and loans. It should be distributed to eighth grade students in junior high schools and to eleventh grade students in high schools. The brochure would serve not only to further lower the financial barrier, but if it works as reported in New York, it would also increase parents' understanding of the opportunities and challenges faced by the student.

Several forms of financial aid have different advantages and disadvantages. The Work-Study Program has been utilized by the University and most of the colleges. The variety of colleges, representing all types of geographic locations, that make effective use of the Work-Study Program should be sufficient evidence that the program should be extended to all State Colleges and Junior Colleges. An important limitation of the Work-Study Program, however, is the time such employment subtracts from the student's study time. Students of borderline ability, to be successful, must devote a larger proportion of their time to study and, therefore, must limit their part-time employment. The use of Work-Study positions for assistance for faculty, as described by the report from the Santa Cruz campus of the University of California, can help to overcome this disadvantage. Frequently such Work-Study positions enhance the student's opportunity for further academic achievement. The State Colleges and the Junior Colleges, as well as the students, could be aided by the utilization of more Work-Study positions for such purposes.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Work-Study Program be extended to those colleges that do not now offer the program, and that the State Colleges assign Work-Study positions to the faculty for duties related to instruction.

Loans do provide an important part of the financial aid program. However, a loan program does have two disadvantages. First, the students from lowest income families are the ones who most need the loans but are the most reluctant to mortgage their economic future. This is particularly true of students who have borderline ability. Secondly, the students who are in most need are viewed by lending agencies as high risk. For these reasons, the existing loan programs have serious limitations as provisions for lowering financial barriers for needy students. However, if government guarantees of payments will assure the availability of such loans for needy students, then the quaranteed loan program can continue to lower financial barriers for disadvantaged students. On the other hand, some proposed changes in the federal loan programs would reduce the availability of such loans to those students most in need. *Therefore it is recommended that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education take all appropriate steps to deter the acceptance by Congress of those changes in the NDEA loan program that would reduce the availability of such loans to disadvantaged students.*

Grants and scholarships offer the most effective means of financial aid in two respects. First, they can increase motivation for students to attend college, as well as to lower the financial barriers. Secondly, they do not detract from the time the student must devote to his studies.

A disadvantage of most scholarship programs is that they are limited to those students in the upper five per cent of ability. The studies that have been made on able students who are not attending college report that about one-half of those students who would fall in the upper third of ability do not attend college. These and other studies have indicated that of those who do not attend college, financial aid is the crucial deterrent. In addition, there is considerable evidence that the recognition of the scholarship program adds to the motivation needed for such students to begin college careers. The Regents' Scholarships fill a gap in this aspect of financial aid. Such a scholarship program would be particularly effective in the State Colleges with the present admissions requirements. Free tuition does not replace the need for scholarships, particularly for disadvantaged students. The costs of college attendance go far beyond tuition.

Therefore, it is recommended that Equal Opportunity Scholarships and Grants, similar to those presently provided by the Regents, be continued for the University and be provided for the State Colleges and Junior Colleges.

More students with disadvantaged backgrounds would be successful in graduate work if they could pursue it full time. Few such students can afford the time for such intensive study because of lack of outside support. Graduate scholarships, particularly in the State Colleges, for full-time graduate study by disadvantaged students is needed. Apparently, there are no such scholarships available in the State College system; some are available within the University.

Therefore, it is also recommended that an Opportunity Scholarship Program for full-time graduate students be developed in the State College system and the University.

GEOGRAPHIC BARRIERS TO INCREASED OPPORTUNITY

Geographic barriers to higher education have much greater national significance than statewide significance in California. With the present planning of the segments of higher education, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, and the State administration and Legislature, it seems likely that what remains of this barrier will be lowered in California in the immediate future. Certainly, the planning of the location of University campuses, State Colleges, and formation of Junior College districts must continue to include consideration of the fact that in large urban centers, transportation is frequently much more difficult for students in disadvantaged areas than in advantaged areas. Similarly, students in the isolated rural disadvantaged areas are also likely to be discouraged from entering higher education because of transportation difficulties. The development of some on-campus residence, at government expense, for Junior Colleges serving isolated rural areas should be encouraged. Such residence should be available to students, even though they are attending on a part-time basis, when they are contributing to family income through local employment.

Serious consideration should be given to priority in developing new residential colleges in the center of the most disadvantaged urban areas. Large campuses of three hundred or more acres, landscaped, with public meeting facilities and, above all, a planned culturally diverse student body could reduce the final geographic barriers to equal educational opportunity. More than this, such colleges could influence the cultural, professional, and civic development of the area surrounding the campus. Such colleges should be essentially residential, particularly for the undergraduates, even though they would be in the center of urban areas. It should be possible for some top administrative personnel and some faculty to live on campus.

The instructional program in such colleges could include those disciplines, vocations, and professions that are most appropriate to the community in which they are placed—social work, public health nursing, education, public administration, but also emphasize the liberal arts disciplines, and the sciences. The enthusiasm with which college students in California have participated in the off-campus tutorials and community involvement projects augurs well for the recruitment of able students to fill the ethnic quotas that would need to be maintained in such colleges.

It is recommended that the Coordinating Council give strong consideration in locating colleges and campuses, both in Northern and Southern California, to the problem of transportation availability for disadvantaged students.

It is further recommended that support be given for the establishment of on-campus residence for campuses located in disadvantaged sections of large urban areas and for Junior Colleges serving rural areas. Ethnic quotas for admission to these residential colleges located in disadvantaged sections of large urban areas should be established.

MOTIVATIONAL BARRIERS TO INCREASED OPPORTUNITY

Research on human motivation makes it clear that much more needs to be known about this facet of human behavior. While it is unlikely that any fundamental improvement can be made toward motivating students who definitely do not want higher education, some reduction in motivational barriers for others may be possible. Expansion of the one-to-one tutorials and encouragement of the community involvement activities of college students can provide motivational models for disadvantaged students that may increase their desire to enter higher education.

Therefore, it is recommended that the governing boards encourage the student off-campus tutorial and community involvement projects by the colleges in all segments of higher education.

College information directed toward parents shows great promise for improving recruitment efforts, based on the reports from the Bronx Community College program and from the reports of counselors and those who have participated in special programs in colleges and campuses in California. It should include not only information on admissions and financial aid, but also information on professional and vocational opportunities that are increased by college attendance.

Short-term institutes, sponsored cooperatively and locally by the segments of higher education, should be held annually for counselors in disadvantaged areas. Junior high counselors, or representative upper grade teachers, should be included in such meetings. The present attempts at recruitment, while outstanding on some individual colleges and campuses, are "spotty," and it is frequently the high schools and junior high schools in disadvantaged areas that are inadequately represented in recruitment activities.

A greater effectiveness in recruitment activities might also be attained by voluntary cooperative scheduling of representatives from the segments of higher education to meet with students and parents in high schools in disadvantaged areas. Regular scheduling of such meetings is more likely to be effective than one-shot open houses during the senior year. Much of the research in the literature indicates that providing such information while a student is still in junior high school and informing parents early can be most effective in lowering motivational barriers to higher education.

A further increase in motivation of disadvantaged students to enroll in college can be obtained by bringing them on campus for participation in special programs. Project Upward Bound, sponsored by the United States Office of Education and funded by the Economic Opportunity Act, is designed specifically to fill this need. Application by a number of colleges in the segments of higher education in California for such projects also needs to be encouraged.

Therefore, to increase motivation of students from disadvantaged areas to attend college, it is recommended that statewide recruitment efforts be launched by all three segments of higher education. Such efforts would be enhanced by the development of television programs, such as those sponsored by San Bernardino Valley College, in its "Project Notify."

ACADEMIC BARRIERS TO INCREASED OPPORTUNITY

In a very strict sense, there are no admissions barriers to increased opportunity for higher education in California. The Junior Colleges continue to support the open-door admissions policies. The University and the State Colleges report very little use of the available two per cent exception provisions as a device for admitting disadvantaged students. Current reports indicate that the two per cent exception provisions may presently be used up for other admissions needs. If this is the case, an additional two per cent exception to the admission requirements of the State Colleges and the University may be needed. For such exceptions, the segment could formally define "disadvantaged student" and then regularly report the number of such students admitted under the exception provision and the methods used to ascertain that the criteria established for the definition have been met.

Therefore, it is recommended that if studies of the existing two per cent exception provision confirm the need, the University and the State Colleges be permitted to allow an additional two per cent exception to their admissions requirements to increase opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students.

After such students have been enrolled, they are frequently in need of additional assistance to overcome academic barriers. For those not in residence, an appropriate place to study should be available. Help with preparation for specific class assignments and preparation for specific examinations frequently make the difference between continuation and drop-out. The Learning Centers being developed in several of the Junior Colleges, such as Harbor Junior College in Los Angeles, appear to justify such a need. Expansion of such centers to include more students and to provide an opportunity for more direct contact with parents would help to lower academic barriers to continuation of disadvantaged students in higher education. Expansion of the number and variety of programmed learning devices in such centers is also needed.

Therefore, it is recommended that State support be given or that federal support be sought to aid in the development and expansion of the Learning Centers on the campuses of several of the Junior Colleges.

The State Colleges have a varied pattern of remedial programs to help students overcome academic difficulties. Some of the colleges charge a fee for non-credit remedial services. Others organize such provisions on a regular class basis. When no fee is charged for such programs, the expense to the state is considerable. If the percentage of such students taking remedial courses who are later successful in completing their college objectives is as low as some reports indicate, then careful study of such programs and consideration of alternatives is needed.

The University also has remedial services organized through Counseling Centers, and evaluation of the effectiveness of these in relation to the cost involved might also be examined. The effectiveness of the one-to-one on-campus tutorials sponsored by students may be much greater than the remedial services, if the percentage of improvement is about the same at the University and State Colleges as it is in the colleges reporting in the literature. It is possible that, considering the role of the three segments of public higher education, remedial services should be concentrated as a distinct function of the Junior College segment. The University, the State Colleges, and the Junior Colleges all offer such services at this time. However, even in Junior Colleges, the effectiveness of the present provisions for remedial services would profit from careful evaluation. Remedial classes with twenty-five to thirty students may not be producing sufficient improvement in the lowering of academic barriers to justify their expense. Alternative avenues for remedial work need to be compared with present practices.

The Junior College Basic Programs are frequently reported to be closely related to the objective of lowering academic barriers in higher education for disadvantaged students. The number of these Basic Programs, whether titled Basic, Level I, or Special Prep Programs, is spreading rapidly among the Junior Colleges. There is some indication at this point that only a small percentage, one five per cent maximum, of students included in such programs ever complete either a vocational or transfer program at a later date. Some colleges report that students drop out of such programs before even reaching their non-vocational and non-transfer goals. Frequently, the strongest result reported is the elimination of such students from the regular classes and the increased academic standards that are possible within the regular classes as a result. Several of the Junior Colleges have already undertaken evaluation of these Basic Programs. Further research on an extended basis needs to be made to determine the effect these programs have on lowering academic barriers to increased opportunity in higher education.

Therefore, it is recommended that a study of the Junior College Basic and Remedial Programs and the State College and University remedial programs be made. This study should examine such programs in relation to their costs, effectiveness, and appropriateness to the role of each segment under the Master Plan. This study should also include an examination of alternative solutions to the problem of overcoming language skill barriers to increase opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students.

One area of concern in provisions in higher education for disadvantaged youth is, in one sense, fundamental to all of the other recommendations. There is a need in the State of California for some continuing basic and applied research in the problems of disadvantaged areas. Major emphasis in such research would need to be in the problems of human resources, and this ultimately would relate to the question of increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged youth.

The need for such research is borne out by at least three different sources. (1) The survey of literature for this study indicates a great need for interdisciplinary research on these problems. (2) The Governor's Commission on the Los Angeles Riots would have been effectively assisted if there had been a continuing institute that brought to bear the disciplines of economics, sociology, psychology, political science, law, health, medicine, social work, anthropology, criminology, education, and public administration to the problems of disadvantaged areas. (3) The Legislature has taken increasing interest in the problems of such areas. However, it is likely that this work would be much more effective if it had the benefit of the research and studies from such an institute. Indirectly, such an institute could have considerable long range effect on increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students.

Therefore, it is recommended that the University of California consider the establishment of an Interdisciplinary Institute or Center for the Study of the Socio-Economically Disadvantaged.

A lack of fundamental and applied knowledge of another type is even more directly related to the problems of this survey. Fundamental research on the teaching of reading and language skills, both at the primary age level and for older youth and adults, is greatly needed. Not only the literature reviewed for this study, but the work of the Governor's Commission on the Los Angeles Riots, the Legislature, and the public schools point toward the need for continuing research in this problem that is basic to the "cycle of failure which is at the core of the problems of the disadvantaged." (Page 49, A Report by the Governor's Commission on the Los Angeles Riots.) Certainly, the academic barriers to increasing opportunities in higher education for disadvantaged students center on this problem. Much more information and much more successful methods need to be developed, created, and tested in the area of teaching reading and language skills, particularly to the disadvantaged.

Therefore, it is recommended that the California State Colleges develop an Institute for the Study of Teaching Reading and Language Skills to the Disadvantaged.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SECTION 1—REFERENCES

[1] Dael G. Wolfle, "Intellectual Resources," *Scientific American*, CLXXXV (1951), pp. 42–46.

[2] Harold M. Hodges, *Social Stratification: Class in America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1964)

[3] Hurley H. Doddy, "The Progress of the Negro in Higher Education," *The Journal of Negro Education*, XXXII (Fall, 1963), pp. 485–492.

[4] Lou LaBrant, "The Goals for Culturally Different Youth," *English Skills of Culturally Different Youth* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Health, Education, and Welfare and Office of Education, 1964), pp. 22–31.

[5] Doddy, *op. cit.*, p. 487.

[6] Basil Bernstein, "Some Sociological Determinants of Perception," *British Journal of Sociology*, IX (June, 1958), pp. 159–174.

[7] Elmer D. West, *Financial Aid to the Undergraduate* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963), p. 110.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 97.

[9] Algo D. Henderson, "Assessment of Current Trends of Opportunity for Higher Education," *Higher Education Incentives and Obstacles* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960), p. 3.

[10] John L. Holland and Laura Kent, "The Concentration of Scholarship Funds and Its Implications for Education," *College and University*, XXXV (Summer, 1960).

[11] Donald L. Thistlethwaite, "College Scholarship Offers and the Enrollment of Talented Students," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXIV (1958).

[12] Rexford G. Moon, *Student Financial Aid in the United States: Administration and Resources* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963).

[13] West, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

[14] Wilbur J. Bender, "Our Student Aid Patchwork Needs Drastic Revision," *Student Financial Aid and National Purpose* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1962), p. 96.

[15] West, *op. cit.*, pp. 32–33.

[16] Robert J. Havighurst, "Encouraging Personal Incentive for Higher Education among Youth from Low-Income Groups," *Higher Education Incentives and Obstacles* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960), p. 96.

[17] Donald L. Thistlethwaite, "Recruitment and Retention of Talented College Students," project carried out under a contract with the United States Office of Education, preliminary draft. (Mimeographed)

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 72.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 285.

[20] West, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

[21] West, *op. cit.*, pp. 83–84.

[22] West, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

[23] West, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

[24] Henderson, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

[25] Henderson, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[26] West, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

[27] Alex A. Daughtry, "The Kansas Surveys of Postgraduation Activities of High School Seniors," *Higher Education Incentives and Obstacles* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960), pp. 52–57.

[28] Henderson, *op. cit.*, pp. 8–9.

[29] *Violence in the City—An End or a Beginning?* A Report by the Governor's Commission on the Los Angeles Riots (Los Angeles: State of California, 1965), p. 65.

[30] Patricia Cayo Sexton, *Spanish Harlem; An Anatomy of Poverty* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 47–70.

[31] Kenneth B. Clark, *Dark Ghetto; Dilemmas of Social Power* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 148–149.

[32] Susan W. Gray, "The Performance of the Culturally Deprived Child: Contributing Variables," mimeographed report, pp. 30–36, obtained from Professor Elsa Mae Smith, School of Education, California State College at Los Angeles.

[33] Eugene Stivers, "Motivation for College in High-School Boys," *The School Review*, LXVI (1958), pp. 341-350.

[34] John U. Monro, "Problems and Responsibilities of Colleges in the Search for Talented Students: Report of a Colloquium," *Higher Education Incentives and Obstacles* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960), p. 34.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[36] Havighurst, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

[37] Elizabeth Douvan, "Social Status and Success Strivings," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, LII (1956), p. 223.

[38] Richard L. Plaut, "Personal Incentive for Higher Education among Deprived Groups," *Higher Education Incentives and Obstacles* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960) p. 103.

[39] Edward L. McDill and James Coleman, "Family and Peer Influences in College Plans of High School Students," *Sociology of Education*, XXXVIII (Winter, 1965), pp. 112-126.

[40] Donald L. Thistlethwaite, "Effects of Social Recognition Upon the Educational Motivation of Talented Youth," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, L (1959), p. 115.

[41] Isabel Beck, report, Harbor Junior College, 1965. (Mimeographed.)

[42] Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and Parental Values," *The American Journal of Sociology*, LXIV (January, 1959), pp. 337-351.

[43] Noel P. Gist and William S. Bennett, "Aspirations of Negro and White Students," *Social Forces*, XLII (October, 1963), pp. 40-48.

[44] Douvan, *op. cit.*, pp. 219-223.

[45] Basil Bernstein, "Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning," *Education, Economy, and Society*, ed. A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1961), pp. 288-314.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 289.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 291.

[48] Paul K. Hatt, "Occupation and Social Stratification," *The American Journal of Sociology*, LV (May, 1950), pp. 533-543.

[49] David P. Ausubel, "The Influence of Experience on the Development of Intelligence," *Productive Thinking in Education*, pp. 45-61. [Incomplete reference taken from Xerox copy.]

[50] Vera P. John and Leo S. Goldstein, "The Social Context of Language Acquisition," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, X (July, 1964), p. 265.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 269.

[52] LaBrant, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

[53] Lawrence Howard, interview at University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, February 16, 1966.

[54] Lotus M. Knief and James B. Stroud, "Intercorrelations Among Various Intelligence, Achievement, and Social Class Scores," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, L (June, 1959), pp. 117-120.

[55] Dorothy M. Knoell, "Institutional Research on Retention and Withdrawal," *Research on College Students*, ed. H. T. Sprague (Boulder, Colorado: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960).

[56] Mildred C. Templin, "Relation of Speech and Language Development to Intelligence and Socio-economic Status," *Volta Review*, LX (September, 1958), pp. 331-334.

[57] Robert R. Knapp, "The Effects of Time Limits on the Intelligence Test Performance of Mexican and American Subjects," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, LI (1960), pp. 14-19.

[58] Alexander W. Astin, "Personal and Environmental Factors Associated with College Dropouts Among High Aptitude Students," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, LV (1964), pp. 219-227.

[59] J. Hopkins, N. Malleson, and I. Sarnoff, "Some Non-Intellectual Correlates of Success and Failure Among University Students," *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXVIII (Fall, 1958), pp. 25-36.

[60] Knapp, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[61] Allison Davis, "Cultural Factors in Remediation," *Educational Horizons*, XLIII (Summer, 1965), pp. 231-251.

[62] Morris Meister and Abraham Tauber, "Experiments in Expanding Educational Opportunity for the Disadvantaged," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLVI (March, 1965), p. 340.

[63] Richard C. Richardson and Paul A. Elsner, "General Education for the Disadvantaged," *Junior College Journal*, XXXVI (December, 1965), p. 18.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[66] Interview with Dean of the College, February 14, 1966.

[67] Richardson and Elsner, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[71] Dael G. Wolfle, "Diversity of Talent," *American Psychologist*, XV (1960), p. 535.

[72] John W. Gardner, *Excellence—Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?* (New York and Evanston: Harper Colophon Books, Harper & Row, 1961), pp. 90-91.

APPENDIX B

SECTION VII—REFERENCES

[1] *Annual Report for the Fiscal Year 1965* (New York: The Carnegie Corporation, 1965), p. 3.

[2] Edward J. Meade, Jr., *Foundations, Schools, and the Public Good* (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1965), p. 6.

[3] *The Long Road to College: A Summer of Opportunity* (New York: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1965), p. 44.

[4] *Education, An Answer to Poverty: School Programs Which May Be Eligible for Federal Aid* (Washington: U. S. Office of Education and Office of Economic Opportunity, 1965), p. 53.

[5] *Financial Aid News* published by College Scholarship Service, VI (December, 1965), College Entrance Examination Board, New York, p. 5.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF CALIFORNIA EDMUND G. BROWN, Governor

CALIFORNIA STATE SCHOLARSHIP COMMISSION
520 CAPITOL MALL
SACRAMENTO

November 13, 1964

REV. HERMAN J. HAUCK
CHAIRMAN
O. CORT MAJORS
VICE CHAIRMAN
DR. ROBERT L. MORLAN
SECRETARY
ELLIOTT CUSHMAN
DR. ROBERT G. FREEMAN
DR. ARTHUR L. GREY, JR.
PETER W. KNOLES
DR. RAYMOND A. RYDELL
ARTHUR S. MARMADUKE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
MRS. DORTHA L. MORRISON
ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR

TO: Members of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education

FROM: California State Scholarship Commission

In accordance with precedent and our newly established relationship, I am pleased to forward for the Commission the major program proposals which the Commission is submitting to the Governor for recommended inclusion in his legislative program. It is our hope that the Coordinating Council will recommend approval by the Governor and the Legislature of these proposals.

The State Scholarship Commission has proposed an expansion of the present tuitional scholarship program and two programs designed to provide assistance to students from the low income groups. The Commission has also approved in principle a work-study program for college students. Because the Federal Work-Study Program has not at this date been crystallized and because there are numerous legal and administrative details to consider, it is not a fully developed program.

The Commission is now completing its Study of Student Aid in California which has been financed by funds through State appropriation and through grants and service from the College Entrance Examination Board and the Educational Testing Service. A study of the need for a graduate fellowship program is in the final stages of completion and the Commission will take the position on this topic at its January meeting.

It is also significant to note that the Commission is not at this time recommending that there be a State sponsored college student loan program. Apparently the expansion of the National Defense Student Loan Program will provide in the immediate future sufficient loan funds in California for students who are in need of this form of financial assistance.

Sincerely,

s/Arthur S. Marmaduke
Executive Director

ASM:ad

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS PROPOSED BY THE CALIFORNIA STATE SCHOLARSHIP COMMISSION

PROGRAM I

Expansion of Present Tuitional Scholarship Program

Principal Objectives: To allow the scholarship program to keep abreast of enrollment increases, to keep pace with additional student need because of cost increases, and to allow expansion of independent college enrollments.

Cost:

	Administration	*Program*
1965–66	$ 70,000	0
1966–67	$100,000	$2,932,800

PROGRAM II

Compensatory Scholarships

Principal Objectives: To provide assistance for books, room and board initially for 500 able students from lower income families who would qualify academically in the regular tuitional program and who need funds beyond tuition and fees to commence or finish their education.

Cost:

	Administration	*Program*
1965–66	$20,000	0
1966–67	$20,000	$250,000

PROGRAM III

College Opportunity Grants

Principal Objectives: To provide college financial assistance to environmentally disadvantaged students who have potential for academic success but who are not identifiable by conventional selection methods.

Cost:

	Administration	*Program*
1965–66	$80,000	0
1966–67	$80,000	$810,000

PROGRAM IV

Work-Study Program for College Students

Principal Objectives: To provide employment opportunities for financially needy college students so they may help themselves meet college expenses.

Cost:

	Administration	*Program*
1965–66	$100,000	0
1966–67	$ 75,000	$1,000,000

PROPOSED EXPANSION OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM OF TUITIONAL GRANTS

The year 1964–65 is the last year of scheduled increase in the number of scholarships authorized by the Education Code. There are, this year, 5,120 State Scholarships and there is no provision for additional scholarships. The California State Scholarship Commission proposes augmenting the present tuitional program by amending the law so that there will be available each year new scholarships equal to two percent of the high school graduates from the prior year plus provision for continuation of State Scholars enrolled in college and eligible for renewal.

The college population and the number of high school graduates, of course, are increasing greatly and it will be necessary to increase the number of State Scholarships authorized by the Education Code simply to maintain the status quo in terms of percentage of the students we are now assisting. We have, in previous years, been able to award scholarships to approximately one percent of the graduating high school seniors. This year we have been able to provide scholarships to approximately three-quarters of one percent of the high school graduates and in the spring of 1965 we will provide scholarships to only slightly more than one-half of one percent of high school graduates.

In planning for the future of the State Scholarship Program we are aware of developments other than sheer population increases which have profound impact upon the problems faced by students and families in paying college costs.

1. College costs have increased markedly over recent years and have increased much faster than income. For example, the total residence cost for a student at the Berkeley campus of the University of California has increased between 1956 and 1963 by approximately forty percent while personal income per capita in California has increased by twenty-three percent over this same period of time. The total cost for a resident student at Occidental College has increased by fifty-seven percent between 1956 and 1963 against the twenty-three percent personal income increase. There is every reason to believe that this trend will continue. We are even now to the point where, for example, the yearly cost for residence at the Berkeley campus is, according to the standards of family and student contribution used by the College Scholarship Service, within the reach of only thirty percent of the two-child families in California. The average costs at independent colleges in California are within the capacity of only fourteen percent of the two-child families and colleges such as the California Institute of Technology, Stanford, Occidental, and Pomona are within the financial capacity of only eight percent of California families.
2. College administered scholarship and financial aid resources (which never have been adequate) will not be able to keep up with increases in costs and enrollment. While alumni and private giving has increased, it is clearly evident it has not been able to keep abreast of the college population and cost explosion.
3. The independent colleges, which have been the primary institutional beneficiaries of the existing State Scholarship Program, have expanded enrollment in recent years and have expanded enrollment considerably more than had been contemplated at the time of the Master Plan for Higher Education projection. The Master Plan projection for 1965 indicated that 72 private institutions would enroll 58,000 students. This figure has been exceeded in 1963 and independent colleges hope to enroll at least 66,000 students in 1965. This continued expansion and its resultant relief of the enrollment pressures on the public colleges cannot be realized unless there is considerable additional assistance to students who wish to attend independent colleges. The independent colleges have advised us that if more State Scholarships had been available this year they could have enrolled approximately 1,750 additional new State Scholarship students. They report a desire to expand enrollment by 1975 by 20,000 students.

To assist the growing number of able students who need financial assistance to pay their tuition and fees, to keep pace with population growth, to further strengthen college scholarship programs, and to encourage and make possible continued expansion of independent colleges and the concomitant relief on State support expenditures at public colleges, we propose an increase in the number of authorized State Scholarships. We propose shifting the basis for determining the number of State Scholarships from a fixed number, as now presently specified in the Education Code, and the enactment of legislation which would provide that scholarships would be available for a specific percentage of the high school graduates so there may be a basis for keeping pace with enrollment increases. While in our Study of Student Aid Report we anticipate that there will be a long range proposal of considerably greater magnitude, we at this time propose that legislation be introduced and approved authorizing State Scholarships in the amount of two percent of the prior year high school graduating class, plus provision for continuation of State Scholars with eligibility.

The additional scholarships and additional costs are as follows:

	Additional Scholarships New and Renewal	*Additional Funds Required New and Renewal*
1966–67	3,666	$ 2,932,800
1967–68	7,251	$ 5,800,800
1968–69	10,819	$ 8,655,200
1969–70	12,500	$10,000,000

PROPOSED PROGRAM OF COMPENSATORY SCHOLARSHIPS—CALIFORNIA STATE SCHOLARSHIP COMMISSION

A program of State Compensatory Scholarships is proposed by the Scholarship Commission. The Compensatory Scholarship Program would provide financial assistance beyond tuition and fees for students who are selected in the regular State Scholarship Program by conventional selection methods. We would propose that there be 500 compensatory scholarships authorized for 1966–67 and an additional 1,000 in each of the two subsequent years with 2,500 compensatory scholarships authorized in 1968–69. The Compensatory Scholarship Program would provide assistance for books and room and board up to a maximum of $800 a year for very able students who have demonstrated outstanding academic achievement and aptitude and who are from lower income families unable to meet the costs of higher education. We would estimate the average award to be $500 representing a scholarship cost of $250,000 in 1966–67 plus costs of administration of $20,000 for 1965–66 and 1966–67.

This program differs from the College Opportunity Grant Scholarship Program in that it is designed primarily for able students who have outstanding achievement, who are from the lower income groups, and who are identifiable by conventional means. We propose this as a permanent program with financing by State General Funds.

This type of program meshes very easily with the regular tuitional scholarship program administered by the California State Scholarship Commission. Selection would be by conventional means and all present criteria and methods would be utilized. The urgency of supplemental financial need to deserving undergraduate students is constantly affirmed by reports to the Commission from students and from colleges and universities. Without exception, these reports stress the inadequacy of the student aid funds, cite cases of financial hardship which either prevent some of our very able young students from commencing or, more often, continuing their college careers. There is an increasing amount of experience with students who simply lack funds to continue their education and are forced to withdraw.

This program would receive support from all segments of higher education. A larger subsistence scholarship program recommended by the Master Plan for Higher Education and approved by the Coordinating Council was introduced in 1963 by Assemblyman Bee, approved by the Assembly Education Committee and failed passage in the Ways and Means Committee on a purely fiscal basis.

PROPOSED PROGRAM OF COLLEGE OPPORTUNITY GRANTS—CALIFORNIA STATE SCHOLARSHIP COMMISSION

The College Opportunity Grant Programs is proposed as one of an experimental nature to be administered by the California State Scholarship Commission with the objectives of providing financial assistance to students from the lower income groups who have college aptitude. Students selected for this program would be those with college potential but who would not be selected in the regular State Scholarship Program by conventional selection methods or be selected for scholarships by conventional admission and scholarship standards in California colleges. The program would be directly aimed at those students who are popularly referred to as environmentally disadvantaged.

Five hundred students would be selected in the first year of this program and an additional one thousand in the two succeeding years to a total of 2,500. At the completion of three years, the program would be evaluated to ascertain if the results warrant its continuance beyond the three-year experimental stage. Selection of the students would be by the California State Scholarship Commission upon recommendation of the student's secondary school principal and the College Opportunity Grant Selection Committee appointed by the Commission from college and secondary school personnel. Subjective judgments concerning potential for college success would be utilized by the Committee as supplemental to objective academic criteria and an objective analysis of financial need. Selection should be limited to students whose family income is less than $6,000 per year and who, in the judgment of the high school principal and selection committee, have not had the cultural opportunities available to students in the college-going population. While we utilize the $6,000 maximum family income figure, it would be the intention to focus efforts upon students whose family incomes are substantially less than $6,000 but would also make exceptions in unusual circumstances for slightly higher income.

To be eligible for a College Opportunity Grant, a student must:

1. Be environmentally disadvantaged;
2. Be in need of financial assistance to attend college;
3. Have demonstrated good citizenship and character;
4. Have graduated from high school within one year of the date of his application;
5. Be a resident of the State of California;
6. Be a citizen of the United States or have been admitted to permanent residence;

7. Enroll in a California college accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges as a full-time undergraduate student.

College Opportunity Grants would:

1. Be administered by the California State Scholarship Commission;
2. Be in the amount of tuition and fees plus up to $800 per year for room, board, and books during the academic year at the college of the student's choice;
3. Vary according to the Scholarship Commission's estimate of the student's financial need;
4. Be renewable up to a period of four years, or completion of the AB degree, provided the student is making normal progress toward the attainment of a degree.

For the grant program in the first year for 500 students, we would estimate an amount of $560,000 would be necessary for awards in 1966–67. This is predicated on the assumption that 150 of the students would attend independent colleges, 200 would attend the University of California and state colleges and 150 would attend junior colleges. Any significant change in this districution would affect either upward or downward the amount of the budget.

We are proposing a program for students who, in our judgment, have potential for college success, whose talent is latent and submerged by cultural disadvantages. These students need financial help and incentive and also need additional preparation and counsel to compensate for the cultural omissions which depress the verbal and quantitative skills fundamental to the successful conclusion of a baccalaureate degree. As a supplement to the grant and as an integral part of the program, we propose special eight-week summer sessions at two centers. Additional centers would be established as the prgoram grew. It would be necessary to provide room and board and transportation for the students and we would, at this juncture, estimate the equivalent of $300 per student or a total of $150,000 for this cost. The cost of instruction and related administrative cost for the summer sessions would be equivalent, we would anticipate, to $100,000 in the first year, bringing the total of the summer session program to $250,000. The total of the program cost then would be $810,000 for 1966–67 and the over-all administrative costs should run approximately 10% or $80,000 for 1965–66, when students would be selected and another $80,000 in 1966–67, bringing the total cost for 1966–67 to $890,000. Administrative costs should decline as a percentage of total cost after the first operational year of the program.

The argument for this program is predicated on the value judment that it is important to assist students who have been economically and environmentally deprived but who in our judgment have considerably more innate ability and potential than shown by grades and standardized tests.

PROPOSED CALIFORNIA WORK-STUDY PROGRAM FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS—CALIFORNIA STATE SCHOLARSHOP COMMISSION

A State sponsored Student Work-Study Program rises form a philosphical premise that students should help themselves to finance a college education and from a practical observation that students, if employment opportunities are made available, can work during the academic year and the summer to help themselves meet college costs without any sacrifice to their academic program.

Most colleges and scholarship awarding agencies operate on the premise that the primary responsibility for financing a college education resides with the student's family. In addition to academic criteria, a financial need assessment procedure is utilized in determining eligibility for scholarship awards and provides a basis for estimating a reasonable contribution from parental income and assets. The State Scholarship Commission and most colleges believe there should be a self-help gap, that is to say, a combination of estimated parental contribution and a scholarship should not provide the full cost of the year at college but that the student should fill this gap. For a variety of reasons, the young and relatively unskilled oftentimes cannot secure the term-time employment which they desire, need, and which is expected of them.

The State Work-Study Program also arises in part from a position that while student loans within reason are a satisfactory form of student financial assistance, there has been and is increasingly an overuse of student loans as a form of financing higher education. We note that loans are being used for the most part by students in the very lowest income groups, working contrary to the principle of equal educational opportunity, and saddling students in many cases with massive debts. There is need for additional employment resources so students may help themselves without resorting to burdensome debts which can be educational and personal deterrents.

A Work-Study Program which would be supplemental in nature to the Federal Work-Study Program of the Economic Opportunity Act is proposed with financing from State General Funds. The details of a State program must be somewhat tentative because the details of this Federal Program have not been crystalized. It is our understanding from the United States Office of Education that there will be approximately six million dollars of Federal Funds available to colleges in California but they will be substantially limited to students whose family income is less than $3,000 per year. Beyond question, there are students from families with more than a $3,000 per year income who have a need for considerable financial assistance and who are willing to work if employment opportunities were available.

We, therefore, propose a State Work-Study Program with a grant in the first year of one million dollars, the funds allocated to the colleges upon application to the State Scholarship Commission. Colleges would select for employment students who would be full-time undergraduate students in need of financial assistance. Term-time employment would not exceed ten hours a week while the student is engaged in full-time study during the academic year. Participating institutions would be required to maintain their own expenditures for student employment at the average amount for the two preceding years as it is the intention of this program to provide supplemental educationally related employment and not supplant presently existing student employment programs. Educationally related employment would be defined by the State Scholarship Commission. Full-time summer employment could be provided by the institution if it falls within the definition of educationally related employment.

The State Scholarship Commission would establish standards for maximum and minimum wages. Students would not be able to receive both the State and the Federal grants.

We propose a one million dollar program for each of the first two years of operation and would allocate $100,000 for administration in the first year of the program.

This proposal is presented as one which has educational merit and as an important means of helping students to help themselves. It must be noted that only preliminary and cursory discussions have been held with the Attorney General's Office and further discussion is necessary to clarify a possible Constitutional question concerning independent college participation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Clark, Kenneth B. *Dark Ghetto; Dilemmas of Social Power.* New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Gardner, John W. *Excellence—Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?* New York and Evanston: Harper Colophon Books, Harper & Row, 1961.

Hodges, Harold M. *Social Stratification: Class in America.* Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1964.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo. *Spanish Harlem; An Anatomy of Poverty.* New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Articles

Astin, Alexander W. "Personal and Environmental Factors Associated with College Dropouts Among High Aptitude Students," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, LV (1964), 219–227.

Ausubel, David P. "The Influence of Experience on the Development of Intelligence," *Productive Thinking in Education*, 45–61. [Incomplete reference taken from Xerox copy.]

Bernstein, Basil. "Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning," *Education, Economy, and Society*, ed. A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press (1961), 288–314.

Bernstein, Basil. "Some Sociological Determinants of Perception," *British Journal of Sociology*, IX (June, 1958), 159–174.

Davis, Allison. "Cultural Factors in Remediation," *Educational Horizons*, XLIII (Summer, 1965) 231–251.

Doddy, Hurley H. "The Progress of the Negro in Higher Education," *The Journal of Negro Education*, XXXII (Fall, 1963), 485–492.

Douvan, Elizabeth. "Social Status and Success Strivings," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, LII (1956), 219–223.

Gist, Noel P. and Bennett, William S. "Aspirations of Negro and White Students," *Social Forces*, XLII (October, 1963), 40–48.

Hatt, Paul K. "Occupation and Social Stratification," *The American Journal of Sociology*, LV (May, 1950), 533–543.

Holland, John L. and Kent, Laura. "The Concentration of Scholarship Funds and Its Implications for Education," *College and University*, XXXV (Summer, 1960), 471–483.

Hopkins, J., Malleson, N., and Sarnoff, I. "Some Non-Intellectual Correlates of Success and Failure Among University Students," *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXVIII (Fall, 1958), 25–36.

John, Vera P. and Goldstein, Leo S. "The Social Context of Language Acquisition," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, X (July, 1964), 265–275.

Knapp, Robert R. "The Effects of Time Limits on the Intelligence Test Performance of Mexican and American Subjects," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, LI (1960), 14–19.

Knief, Lotus M. and Stroud, James B. "Intercorrelations Among Various Intelligence, Achievement, and Social Class Scores," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, L (June, 1959), 117–120.

Kohn, Melvin L. "Social Class and Parental Values," *The American Journal of Sociology*, LXIV (January, 1959), 337–351.

LaBrant, Lou. "The Goals for Culturally Different Youth," *English Skills of Culturally Different Youth*, Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Office of Education, 1964.

McDill, Edward L. and Coleman, James. "Family and Peer Influences in College Plans of High School Students," *Sociology of Education*, XXXVIII (Winter, 1965), 112–126.

Meister, Morris, and Tauber, Abraham. "Experiments in Expanding Educational Opportunity for the Disadvantaged," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLVI (March, 1965), 340.

Richardson, Richard C. and Elsner, Paul A. "General Education for the Disadvantaged," *Junior College Journal*, XXXVI (December, 1965), 18.

Stivers, Eugene. "Motivation for College in High-School Boys," *The School Review*, LXVI (1958), 341–350.

Templin, Mildred C. "Relation of Speech and Language Development to Intelligence and Socio-economic Status," *Volta Review*, LX (September, 1958), 331–334.

Thistlethwaite, Donald L. "College Scholarship Offers and the Enrollment of Talented Students," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXIV (1958), 421–424, 467–468.

Thistlethwaite, Donald L. "Effects of Social Recognition Upon the Educational Motivation of Talented Youth," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, L (1959), 116.

Wolfle, Dael G. "Diversity of Talent," *American Psychologist*, XV (1960), 535–545.

Wolfle, Dael G. "Intellectual Resources," *Scientific American*, CLXXXV (1951), 42–46.

Reports

Bender, Wilbur J. "Our Student Aid Patchwork Needs Drastic Revision," *Student Financial Aid and National Purpose.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1962.

Carnegie Corporation. *Annual Report for the Fiscal Year 1965.* New York: The Carnegie Corporation, 1965.

Daughtry, Alex A. "The Kansas Surveys of Postgraduation Activities of High School Seniors," *Higher Education Incentives and Obstacles.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Encouraging Personal Incentive for Higher Education among Youth from Low-Income Groups," *Higher Education Incentives and Obstacles.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Henderson, Algo D. "Assessment of Current Trends of Opportunity for Higher Education," *Higher Education Incentives and Obstacles.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Knoell, Dorothy M. "Institutional Research on Retention and Withdrawal," *Research on College Students*, ed. H. T. Sprague. Boulder, Colorado: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960.

Meade, Edward J., Jr. *Foundations, Schools, and the Public Good.* New York: The Ford Foundation, 1965.

Monro, John U. "Problems and Responsibilities of Colleges in the Search for Talented Students: Report of a Colloquium," *Higher Education Incentives and Obstacles.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Moon, Rexford G. *Student Financial Aid in the United States: Administration and Resources.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963.

Plaut, Richard L. "Personal Incentive for Higher Education among Deprived Groups," *Higher Education Incentives and Obstacles.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Rockefeller Foundation. *The Long Road to College: A Summer of Opportunity.* New York: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1965.

State of California. *Violence in the City—An End or a Beginning?* A Report by the Governor's Commission on the Los Angeles Riots. Los Angeles: State of California, 1965.

U. S. Office of Education and Office of Economic Opportunity. *Education, An Answer to Poverty: School Programs Which May Be Eligible for Federal Aid.* Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education and Office of Economic Opportunity, 1965.

West, Elmer D. *Financial Aid to the Undergraduate.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963.

Unpublished Reports

Beck, Isabel. Report for Harbor Junior College, 1965. (Mimeographed.)

Gray, Susan W. "The Performance of the Culturally Deprived Child: Contributing Variables,' mimeographed report obtained from Professor Elsa Mae Smith, School of Education, California State College at Los Angeles.

Thistlethwaite, Donald L. "Recruitment and Retention of Talented College Students," project carried out under a contract with the United States Office of Education. Preliminary draft (Mimeographed.)

Other Sources

College Scholarship Service. *Financial Aid Views*, VI (December, 1965). New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Loop Junior College, Chicago. Personal interview with the Dean of the College. February 1[illegible], 1966.

University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee. Personal interview with Lawrence Howard, Director of the Institute on Human Relations. February 16, 1966.

76833—453 7-66 1,500 *printed in* CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF STATE PRINTING